THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

VOL. XXXIV, No. 2 APRIL, 1927

"Was Man Evolved from Animal?"
JOHN R. SWANTON 129

Materials for an Estimate of Swedenborg's Historical Position and Influence. IV.
LEWIS F. HITE 167

The 25th Anniversary of the Cambridge Society
CHARLES H. TAFT 191

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

The Idea of God LEWIS F. HITE - - - - - - - 209
A Hundred Years in Brockton WM. F. WUNSCH - - - 220

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

The Walls, Gates and Foundations of the Holy City
WARREN GODDARD - - - - - - - - - 226
What Use Can We Make of Swedenborg's Memorable Relations? C. EDGAR RITTER - - - - - - 235

Current Literature :

Dr. Sydney Cave's "The Doctrine of the Person of Christ"
WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - - - - - - 241
Edward Gordon Selwyn's "Essays, Catholic and Critical"
AUSTIN WARREN, PH.D. - - - - - - - - 245
Wm. F. Wunsch's "An Outline of New-Church Teaching"
JOHN REX SHEPLER - - - - - - - - - 249
N. Levison's "The Parables" WM. L. WORCESTER - - - 254
Thomas Van Ness' "The Religion of New England"
AUSTIN WARREN, PH. D. - - - - - - - 255

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 20 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXIV.] APRIL, 1927 [No. 2

"WAS MAN EVOLVED FROM ANIMAL?"

AN ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS.*

BY JOHN R. SWANTON, PH. D.

AT the beginning of 1926 the American New-Church Tract Society offered a prize of one hundred dollars for the best essay on the subject "Was Man Evolved from Animal?" The only conditions of the contest were that each contribution was not to exceed thirty-five hundred words, that it was to be submitted on or before April 30th of that year, and, naturally, that the names of the competitors were to be kept secret until a decision had been rendered by the judges. Rev. William F. Wunsch of the New-Church Theological School and the writer of the present paper were asked to serve in the last-mentioned capacity.

Announcement of the contest was made in the *Helper* for February 3, and in the *New-Church Messenger* for February 17, 1926; and as a result of this and other publicity fifty-three papers were presented. A thorough examination of these resulted in the award being made to paper No. 32,

* This paper is published as an interesting summary of the discussion of the doctrine of evolution occasioned by the offer of a prize for a brief essay (not to exceed thirty-five hundred words) on the subject. Dr. Swanton deserves our appreciation for his earnest labor in preparing it, and in presenting his own views at relevant points. The REVIEW expects in the near future to present some further discussion of the subject.

which proved to be by the Rev. Frederic R. Crownfield. Second place was given to paper No. 31, by the Rev. E. M. L. Gould; and third place to paper No. 13, by Miss Alice F. Spiers. The prize essay was printed in the *Helper* for October 27, 1926 (Volume 78, No. 11).

The necessary reading and re-reading of the various papers submitted convinced the present writer that much of the benefit of this contest would be lost unless some use were made of the interesting suggestions and divergent points of view contained in the essays as a whole. Accordingly he presented to the Tract Society a plan for some sort of symposium to include the more important contributions, offering his editorial services for the undertaking: and it received the Society's endorsement. On further consideration it was concluded that a symposium would be impracticable; and it was decided instead to prepare a single comprehensive article in which an endeavor should be made to cover all of the more important points touched upon by the essayists, and to illustrate them as far as possible by means of excerpts from the pages of the several authors. The present article represents an attempt to carry out this plan.

In the judgment of the present writer practically all of the fifty-three essayists were motivated by actual interest in the subject, and not merely by the hope of winning a prize; but a number of them were inadequately equipped for the undertaking, and the points made were often better expressed by others; therefore only the papers of the following sixteen were selected for the proposed treatment: Rev. Frederic R. Crownfield (the prize essayist), Mr. Francis Morton Currier, Mr. William W. Cutler, Mr. William C. Dick, Rev. L. H. Edmiston, Rev. E. L. M. Gould, Rev. Paul Hartley, Mr. Lawrence Lay, Mr. F. Moulton McLane, Mr. T. Mower Martin, Mr. Ernest Rabone, Rev. Herbert C. Small, Rev. John E. Smith, Miss Alice F. Spiers, a contributor who preserved his anonymous character, and one other who wishes his name withheld. Three of these, all apparently laymen, are evidently outside of our church body.

Of the remainder, omitting the anonymous essayist, eight are ministers and four laymen. Only one woman appears in the number; but, as we have seen, her contribution stands high in order of excellence. In justice to some of the participants in the contest it should be said that certain offerings were excluded on account of their length, while all of those submitted by non-New-Churchmen had to be passed over because it was understood that a contribution from a distinctively New-Church point of view was desired. All of the sixteen are favorable to evolution except Messrs. Martin, Smith, and Dick; and the last mentioned is the only one to suggest an alternative hypothesis. Thanks are due to all the writers for permission to use their papers in the following discussion.

An important point to be noted at the very beginning is that, although the question ostensibly concerned only the relation of man to animal, the entire problem of evolution was almost necessarily involved; and our treatment has therefore been expanded to cover it. Obviously the first matter requiring attention is the definition of the term "evolution".

Evolution Defined.

With few exceptions, writers of the thirty-seven manuscripts not retained for the present special treatment plunged into the midst of their task without attempting to define the nature of the problem with which they were to deal. We might well excuse them for trusting to the common sense of their readers as to the nature of an animal or a man; but what scientists commonly understand by evolution must be clearly apprehended before it is criticized, and this they uniformly failed to explain. To most of them it was a well-known something, and generally a bogy to be attacked and dispatched with all possible expedition, without asking any further questions. Even some of the more careful writers did not vouchsafe a clear-cut statement, though several, in the course of the discussion, gave a pretty good indication of what they had in mind.

A few of the sixteen, assuming the scientific hypothesis to

be known, pass at once to a consideration of its possible metaphysical implications. Several, like Mr. Lay, dwell upon the fact that evolution is a process, not a cause; and one or two accuse scientists of mistaking it for a cause, which criticism would be true only in certain cases. This sensitiveness is chiefly exhibited by contributors with a pronounced theological bias. On the other hand Mr. McLane, whose leanings are as markedly scientific, errs in claiming that scientists understand by evolution "evolution by natural selection". While selection is generally accepted as a contributing evolutionary factor, it is far from being the only one recognized. In fact, at the present time, there is a tendency to minimize its importance. Another of the writers affirms that "evolution, in its broad aspect, is the science of the origin of the natural universe, including the solar system, and the origin and development of living forms in the earth". This is too broad, for the same might be said of the doctrine of special creation, or of any other hypothesis attempting to explain our cosmos. Our anonymous friend also falls short in saying that "the theory of evolution concerns the apparent origin of both man and animals from matter"; because evolution involves not merely the first stage of organic life, but the succeeding series of changes up to man; and it even includes those which take place in the inorganic world. Mr. Hartley states that "evolution is an ever-upward course of plants and animals, with nothing to do with cause". His closing assertion is correct enough, but as to the "ever-upward tendency", while science does not deny it, neither does it care to make an absolute affirmation of it. Miss Spiers brings us nearer, when she states that evolution teaches that "all living things —plants and animals, including man—were created by a series of degrees of formation; developing from simple to ever more complex forms"; and Mr. Cutler, a step nearer still by the assertion that "the essential thing in the idea of evolution is the principle of continuity, or causal relation that obtains through nature. Nothing appears suddenly or

without natural cause. Everything is the natural outcome of a previous condition". But of course "cause" must not be understood in the absolute sense, and the gist of his thought is given more clearly by Mr. Small, when he describes evolution as "a slow and gradual development, in which each new phase grew out of the preceding one". Mr. Gould quotes the definition of the present writer, towards which the latter has a natural bias; but this it will not be necessary to repeat, especially in view of the very complete and accurate definition of Mr. Crownfield, the prize essayist, who says it is the doctrine that "All organic forms have been produced from an original simple form or forms, as the result of the action over a long period of time of forces still in operation which tend to produce, conserve, and accumulate differences". It will be noticed that he is defining organic evolution alone, since the problem he has in hand concerns inorganic evolution only remotely.

As a characterization of evolution in its more extended sense, Mr. Lay introduces Herbert Spencer's famous definition, to the effect that it "is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation". But, in the light of twentieth century science, this must be characterized as defective in several particulars. First, it is doubtful whether motion is really "dissipated", and in any case it is certain that neither the initial inorganic substance nor the initial organic substance or substances were ever "indefinite" or "incoherent". And such substances must be considered simple only with relation to the structures afterwards built from them. As Swedenborg would say, they are simple only "in their degree". But, as just stated, this aspect of evolution does not intimately concern us.

Returning to Mr. Crownfield's definition, the present writer would suggest two slight changes to add to its clarity. In the first place, the "simple form or forms" of which he

speaks can, as has just been pointed out, be such only relatively, and therefore the word "relatively" might well be substituted for "original", the context itself indicating that the form is supposed to be original. Secondly, the use of the preposition "from" might be criticized as implying that the total content of the derivative form was taken from the original substance, when in fact that is merely an appearance. There is evidence that it does not express the entire truth. On the other hand, if such a word as "through" were substituted, it might carry the suggestion too far in the opposite direction. The use of both to check each other off might perhaps solve the difficulty, and our definition would then read: "Evolution is the doctrine that all organic forms have been produced from or through a relatively simple form or forms, as the result of the action over a long period of time of forces still in operation which tend to produce, conserve, and accumulate differences." This includes: (1) origin from a relatively simple form or forms; (2) the action of forces identical with, or congruous with, those with which we are familiar; (3) their operation through a long period of time; (4) connection of all organisms by direct descent or collaterally; and (5) production and accumulation of differences.

If this definition is carefully examined, much of the perturbation which religious-minded people experience in connection with the subject of evolution will vanish. Note that nothing is said regarding the cause of the relatively simple original form, or regarding the cause of the later differences. And this would hold, even if we stated that our original simple form came into existence "from or through" the mineral kingdom. In each case there is a difference; but whether it is of natural or extra-natural origin is left an open question. True, the definition goes on to assert that later organic forms have been produced "as the result of the action . . . of forces still in operation"; and some of those forces are familiar ones of the material world. But the definition does not limit us to them. We may, if we choose,

regard the phenomena of life as effects of an interior world, and maintain, as does Swedenborg, that the material or solar forces act merely on the outward parts of organisms as assistants in the production of those effects. But we are running ahead of the argument. We shall return to this later, but must now consider various objections to the evolutionary theory as a whole.

Arguments in Opposition to Evolution.

1. *"Evolution has not been proved."*—Anti-evolutionists are fond of reminding their readers that, "after all, there is no absolute proof of evolution", which the less scrupulous among them distort for propaganda effect into the assertion that "it is only a guess". Mr. Lay, one of the most thoughtful and fair-minded contributors from outside our church body, deals with this particular contention very effectively. He admits indeed that "in fairness to all who do not believe in evolution and who fear the consequence of such belief, it must be stated that there is no absolute proof of organic evolution". But there is no absolute proof of numerous other beliefs, including many of those dearest to the hearts of anti-evolutionists themselves, such as the existence of God and of the human soul. To a New-Churchman it should be regarded as a beautiful token of the Divine Love that there is none; that man is not forced but invited to belief. And in view of the stupendous and revolutionary conceptions, especially the theory of relativity, which latter-day science has brought in its train, we must humbly acknowledge that even the most assured beliefs are less assured than we had supposed. Belief in any principle or event rests essentially upon the strength of the evidence which supports it; and this is patently the case in matters of which no human being could have been directly cognizant. And so Mr. Lay says:

> We have no absolute proof of anything that depends upon records of past events. We merely have evidences which we accept, such as accounts left by historians, because they seem reasonable and consistent with what we know of life. All evidences which establish our various beliefs are very much alike. The proof of an

hypothesis, whether it be the nebular, the planetesimal, or the evolutionary, is never absolute. It consists of a mass of facts which appear explicable only on the assumption that the hypothesis is true. If all known facts are in accord with a given hypothesis, and none can be found that are incapable of being reconciled with it, the hypothesis is considered a proved theory. There are many popularly accepted theories about the earth whose proof is exactly of the same type as the proof of organic evolution. Lyell's theory of geologic evolution is commonly accepted, and yet its basis is in the assumption that the key to the past lies in the present; that the changes that are going on today are of the same order and kind as those of the past. The only proof we have of Lyell's conception is the array of facts derived from a study of the earth's crust, its stratified structure, traces of animal and plant life preserved in rocks, and observed changes that are now going on. Yet there is scarcely any opposition to this theory of geologic evolution, although its proof is exactly of the same type as that of organic evolution. . . .

On the other hand the anti-evolutionist faces the problem of finding a consistent position on the question. If he rejects evolution merely because of the nature of the evidences that support it, he is bound to reject a whole mass of other conceptions that have already become a part of his mental stock. If he makes a wholesale rejection of all beliefs concerning the material universe that have been established in his mind by evidences like those of evoluton, he finds himself in utter confusion. No one can do it.

And Mr. McLane pertinently remarks:

If we deny the theory of evolution on the ground that it contradicts one of the accounts of creation as given in Genesis, we must be logical. Are we prepared to discard also, along with evolution, our belief in the sphericity of the earth, the movement of the earth, the fact that the moon has no light of its own? Are we prepared to do so? I think not. Yet that is where logic, or common sense, leads us.

An exposition of the entire strength of the evidence for evolution would of course be impracticable in essays limited to thirty-five hundred words; and, as the general nature of it is pretty well understood, and only the link between animal and man is actually involved in the question proposed, many of our contributors took it for granted. Brief résumés were attempted, however, by Miss Spiers and Messrs. Currier, Lay, and Crownfield, and something more

extended by Mr. McLane. These lines of evidence include comparative anatomy, the study of classification, embryology, paleontology, geographical distribution, blood tests, and genetics.

2. *"Evolution is humiliating to man."*—As some contributors notice, the nature of much fundamentalist opposition shows clearly that it is grounded, not in a calm exercise of the reasoning faculty, but in an instinctive revulsion against the conclusions which an acceptance renders necessary. This is clearly shown by the fact that many persons are willing to accept the theory as applied to everything below man, but are stubbornly opposed to an admission of the same process when applied to humanity. This ground is taken so frequently that some of our essayists, such as Mr. Cutler and Miss Spiers, take particular pains to show that man cannot be excepted from the evolutionary implications, while Mr. Crownfield devotes a special subdivision of his essay to combating the idea that acceptance of the hypothesis tends to degrade our idea of human nature. Mr. Cutler, in referring to such as are sensitive upon the subject, says: "Many of these people probably believed in their childhood that babies came directly from heaven, or were brought by the stork. As they grew older, they came to learn the real truth, that their origin was similar to the origin of other animals", and gave in gracefully to the fact without yielding up their religion. But usually the instinct at work here is that form of self-love which is always striving to glorify the individual at the expense of his fellows. The old monarchical idea, and the hero psychology which our popular fiction both expresses and encourages, tend to the suggestion that certain persons are more dearly beloved of God than others, that they are "children of destiny" and have a "special mission" in the world. This idolon seems to be confirmed by the patent truth that in certain lines some people are abler than others; that some are far more in the public eye; and that in the historical record some stand out above their fellows, while their names are to this day house-

hold words. But even when corrected by the vista of time, human valuations are probably very far astray. Many of the "unhonored and unsung" may have done much more for mankind than its supposed heroes. And when, as is too seldom the case, we look at such matters rationally, we cannot fail to recognize that no child of God is unloved by Him; that potencies are so distributed that all must tend to work together for the common good, in so far as men themselves are willing to cooperate; and finally, that the extent to which they do cooperate is known to Him alone, as we are incapable of judging it.

As is the case with the "gifted individual", so it is with the "chosen people". That term was appropriated by the Israelites, and they were allowed to think themselves such because the conceit enabled them to fulfil their destiny the better. But they were a "chosen people" neither more nor less than other people; they performed one particular service for mankind, and each of the remaining peoples performed some particular service. They were "different from", not "superior to" others. So it is with the "higher" castes, the "privileged classes", and the so-called "superior races", such as the Nordics, the Teutons, the Aryans, the Anglo-Saxons. So it is with Americans. So it is with the "white race". Each has its function to perform, a function no better and no worse than that of any other race or people. Distinctions of function among men are God-made; distinctions of superior and inferior are man-made.

However, at various times and in various places, specific families, clans, tribes, castes, nations and races have claimed superiority, based on separateness and excellence of descent, sometimes extending their ancestry to the gods. Staunch fundamentalists have in this particular frequently been willing enough to stretch the text of Scripture sufficiently to provide different original pairs for the darker peoples. Indeed, polygenesis has always derived considerable support from just this kind of prejudice. But notwithstanding, the oneness of the species man as he exists today

becomes more and more apparent; and, so far as biologists are concerned, polygenism retreats farther and farther into the shadows.

It is not surprising, however, to find race prejudice become converted into species prejudice, and reappear in full force at the suggestion of a connection with the humbler forms of organic life. It is the same self-love in a slightly different form, and it is fated to the same disaster. Coarse and repellent as the ape may seem, it is a fact that he is reflected part for part in the human organism; and on these grounds alone the gap between ape and man is much narrower than a dozen others farther down in the animal series. Repellent as he is to most on first acquaintance, he at least serves as a useful warning—one frequently cited by Swedenborg—of what man would be without his spiritual nature or with his spiritual nature defiled. An eminent paleontologist, Marcellin Boule, says of monkeys in general: "They have strong passions; it has been truly said that they reflect mankind in its lowest qualities."

Another point should be commended to fundamentalists, —one which a churchman as orthodox as Gladstone observed, and to which Mr. Currier calls attention: that "descent from some lower form of life should hardly be more distasteful than descent from 'the dust of the ground'." Certainly everyone ought to recognize the superiority of the ape to dust. If not, a short course in anatomy will enlighten him.

In the introduction to his paper Mr. Gould gives an able discussion of this aspect of fundamentalist opposition, which is worth quoting here *in extenso:*

> What used to be known as moral or righteous indignation is nowadays looked on with increasing scepticism. It has been shown pretty conclusively that, whatever might be true in theory, most of us are in fact stirred to anger only when something attacks our self-love. It is rather offended ego than zeal for truth which makes a man burn when someone casts doubt on his convictions; and the cause for our strong repugnance to a new idea is to be found, not in that idea's assault on truth or morals, but in our own mental inertia, pride or self-interest.

That this is true of a great deal of the current opposition to the doctrine of evolution may be seen from the relatively minor phase of the doctrine against which popular denunciation is most often launched: the idea, as it is put, that "man evolved from animal". Such a statement may mean any number of quite different things, its truth or its falsehood actually hinging almost wholly on how its terms are defined. But there are those for whom its very words are sufficient to arouse such violence of feeling that it is almost impossible to discuss them at all. The "man in the street", having heard a rumor that someone is saying his grandfather was a monkey, at once seeks to call down upon the head of the slanderer all the perils of religion and law.

As a matter of fact, however, when he does this he violates the first and essential principles of that very Christianity behind which he has theoretically taken hiding. If the Christian religion means anything, it means two things: unqualified love for one's neighbors; and an open-minded search for truth. If one genuinely loves his neighbor, the fact that that neighbor holds erroneous or dangerous opinions will give rise to sorrow, not to indignation; and if one is open-minded, he will not condemn any new opinion until he has given it full and affirmative consideration.

3. "*Evolution endangers religious faith.*"—On this point Mr. Lay says:

> A little thoughtful consideration should convince anyone that it is not mere belief in evolution that constitutes the source of our present-day religious strife. Plainly it is the philosophical inferences that are made from this belief that really matters. Not until both sides to the controversy have recognized this fact can we hope to unsnarl the knotty problems of our religious thinking.

These "philosophical inferences" are not such as are active merely in scholastic circles, but those which threaten, or appear to threaten, the faith of great masses of people. Abstract philosophy disturbs few; but the philosophical attitudes which have been adopted into great world religions touch the thought and the lives of millions. Such inferences may be divided into two classes: (a) those which affect our understanding of the narrative of beginnings contained in the first chapters of Genesis; and (b) inferences affecting faith in general. We will consider these in this order.

(3a) *Evolution and the Genesis narrative.*—Attempts to

reconcile the results of scientific investigation with Genesis have been endless. Since Swedenborg held that the early chapters of Genesis are not to be taken literally, New-Churchmen are not much affected by the pother which this discussion has occasioned; but even they assume different attitudes regarding it, some maintaining that there is a certain literal correspondence between the sequence of events as given in the Genesis narrative and the actual facts, while others tend, if not to deny this, at least to minimize it. But, naturally enough, the interest in this phase of the controversy is more acute outside of our organization. Among the contributors to our contest, each side has its champion. One of these attempts a rather elaborate set of parallels; but Mr. Currier, who holds the opposite view, says:

> If *Genesis* is accepted as a truthful account of creation, the problem is ended right here. Evolution will need no more study. It will simply be discarded. For *Genesis* gives an explicit account of creation, and it does not agree at all with evolution. No possible interpretation can make it agree. The substitution of "periods of time for days" does not help at all. Those who have said that modern science has only confirmed the truth of *Genesis* have either been mistaken, or they have lied. There is no better established truth than the fact that *Genesis* and evolution cannot be made to agree.

If a detailed agreement between Genesis and evolution is demanded, Mr. Currier's contention is undoubtedly correct; but if we merely look for certain very general correspondences, there is something to be said on the other side. First, however, it is important to try to form an idea of what the author of the Genesis cosmogony had in mind apart from later re-interpretations. The present writer believes that the system he was trying to portray will appear clearer from the following table:

First Day	Fourth Day
Event in the sky or atmospheric world; Creation of *light.*	Creation of various *light*-bearing bodies (sun, moon, stars).

SECOND DAY	FIFTH DAY
Creation of vault of sky, separating the *waters*.	Creation of *water* animals and birds (a. whales, b. fishes, c. birds).
THIRD DAY	SIXTH DAY
Emergence of *land;*	Creation of *land* animals (a. cattle, b. creeping thing, c. beast of the earth, d. man).
Production from it of vegetables (a. grass, b. herb yielding seed, c. fruit tree yielding fruit).	

Note that three generals, or three environments, are created on the first three days, and that on the next three days the particular objects or beings belonging to or living in them are brought forth. It is possible that the originator of this system thought of sun, moon, and stars as animate beings, or borne by animate beings; in which case they would have been inhabitants of the region of light, much as the fishes and whales were inhabitants of the waters, and cattle, creeping things, beasts, and men, of the earth. The significant event of the first day is the creation of *light;* the significant event of the second day is what is done with *water;* and the significant event of the third day, what is done with *land*. Then, as previously said, we have the inhabitants of the realms of light, water, and land introduced into them. Of course there are great differences in treatment. Thus light was "created"; water, being already in existence, was separated into the sky and earth waters; and land was brought above the waters. The creation of birds looks like an anomaly; but they seem to have been introduced on the fifth day, because they were associated with the vault of heaven, though the author of the system may have believed that they originated in the celestial waters,—the thought of some primitive peoples. The originator of this plan—confining our attention to the literal text—seems to have been thinking rather of classification than of sequences; and so we need not extend his days into geologic periods. Our thought will be clearer if we represent each

day as a step which may very well have been contemporaneous with other steps.

Of course it was a mistake, but one common to primitive men, to suppose that light could exist apart from the sun and the stars; and it was a mistake to suppose that there was a lake of water on top of the sky. But though water and land did not actually create animals and plants, animals and plants could not exist without them; and this much is true, that the environment does determine the specific forms which animals and plants take. It was natural that plants should be regarded rather as products of the land than of the water, because their dependence on the land is more direct and evident. The three sorts of plants mentioned as creations of the third day, the three sorts of animals mentioned as creations of the fifth day, and the three mentioned first on the sixth day, are probably associated classificatorily and not sequentially. Finally, our primitive cosmologist was right in certain fundamentals: as that the inorganic preceded the organic; that habitat must precede inhabitants; that the vegetable kingdom was prior to the animal; and that man was the last in time of all organisms. And New-Churchmen believe that this näive system was evolved and introduced into the Sacred Writings for other reasons than to inform mankind about the origin of the material world.

Another analogy between Genesis and science is suggested by Mr. Lay, when he compares "the earth without form and void, and darkness upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters" with Herbert Spencer's famous definition of evolution already quoted. But for reasons above given, Spencer's definition is not now as representative as it was at the end of the last century.

However, the same contributor passes the most enlightened judgment on the Genesis story of the creation of man, when he remarks:

> The Bible tells what God created, but it does not tell how He did it. It tells out of what He made man, and into whose image He made him; but not a word as to the process or manner of the

making. Therefore the concept of evolution as an unfolding process of life from the simplest form up to man as the culminating achievement of God's creation, is not in conflict with the Bible: and man is morally free to investigate such a concept with all the resources at his command.

(3b) *Evolution and materialism.*—The accusation of materialism is constantly leveled against the theory of evolution. This is due in part to the fact that it runs counter to the prejudices of the accusers, in part to a misunderstanding of the theory itself, and in part to the materialistic metaphysical systems which have been built upon it. With the first of these we need not concern ourselves. The second is usually based on the argument that, since evolutionists hold that one organism has evolved from another, and the first of all from inorganic substances, they must believe that there is nothing in the daughter organism not present in the parent, and nothing in the primal organism not present in the inorganic substances from which it sprang. But this is a metaphysical deduction which evolutionists refuse to make. It is evident that part of the substance of the parent passes into the child; it is not at all evident that all of the substance of the child had that origin. Our own bodies are constantly rebuilt out of inorganic materials, for organic matter deprived of life is nothing else; but it does not therefore follow that we consist only of inorganic materials.

Some scientists—but more hangers-on and would-be popularizers of science—have erected metaphysical systems of greater or less magnitude upon evolutionary foundations; and certain of these writers have assumed an offensive air of proprietorship toward science which has deceived many people. In consequence, not a few religious leaders have attacked the theory as a whole, and by locking out of the church those who believed in it, have thrown many earnest souls into the arms of the enemies of religion. This is another most unfortunate example of "emptying out the baby with the bath". The influence of Haeckel's "Riddle of the Universe" has been particularly mischievous in this direction; and two essayists, Messrs. Martin and Smith,

make specific mention of it. It is sufficient to say that one need not withhold one's appreciation of Haeckel's scientific attainments, while declining to accept his philosophical opinions. Herbert Spencer was another popular expounder of evolutionary metaphysics whose conclusions need not be identified with the accredited conclusions of working scientists.

We may best summarize our findings here in the words of Mr. Lay:

> There is no necessary connection between evolution and materialism. In this respect evolution is like any other law of nature, except that it is the law which breaks down the last barrier, and reveals that the whole domain of nature is subject to law.

But, indeed, if all of those who have a case of nerves on this question would but read the searching examination of the problem made by Joseph Le Conte, the great American geologist, many years ago, their troubles should be at an end. We may at least quote from him that passage cited by Mr. Lay:

> Let no one imagine, as he is conducted by the materialistic scientist in the paths of evolution from the inorganic to the organic, from the organic to the animate, from the animate to the rational and moral, until he lands, as it seems to him, logically and inevitably, in universal materialism—let no such one imagine that he has walked all the way in the domain of science. He has stepped across the boundary into the domain of philosophy. But, on account of the strong tendency to materialism and the skillful guidance of his leaders, there seems to be no such boundary; he does not distinguish between the inductions of science and the inferences of a shallow philosophy; the whole is accredited to science, and the final conclusion seems to carry with it all the certainty which belongs to scientific results.

It is indeed "tragic", as Mr. Edmiston well says, "that evolutionary data should be perverted to bolster up a scientific cult of materialism",—though the word "scientific" here might well be omitted.

4. *"Evolution is contradicted by the evidence."*—Certain opponents of evolution not only hold that the hypothesis is unproved, but pass beyond, and maintain that it is con-

trary to the actual evidence. This is the result of a curiously persistent misunderstanding of the direction of evolutionary change. It is involved in the oft-repeated delusion that "evolution teaches that man is descended from the monkey", or that "man is descended from the ape",—which, in truth, mean about the same thing to most of those who use the terms, since they do not know the difference between monkey and ape. Not merely the man on the street, but, unfortunately, many exceptionally intelligent persons, suppose evolutionists to teach that man sprang directly from monkeys and apes such as exist at the present day; and they magnify the error by extending the assumed teaching to all the lower living animal forms. This delusion is so persistent that it deserves a special technical term. It survives and reemerges in spite of the most patient and minute explanations of the actual evolutionary belief. Let us consider two comparisons by way of illustration. (1) If two logs are washed ashore on opposite sides of a river, each sawed in such a manner at one end that the sawed surfaces fit perfectly, we naturally infer that they were originally one log, and that they came from some point higher up the stream. Now, if we assume that the two logs, while preserving the traces of their original unity, have changed markedly since they were cut apart, we shall have an analogy with the flow of evolution. The river then corresponds to the stream of time, the two parts of the log to two organisms which have gradually become separated in descent, and the alterations the changes which the organisms undergo in course of separation and specialization. The error which we have been considering is like the error of a person who should suppose one log to have remained stationary while the other moved to the other side of the river crosswise of the current. (2) The evolutionary process might also be imaged as a tree with central trunk dividing into branches, first large branches and, then smaller ones down to minute twigs. The tips of the twigs would stand for living species of plants and animals; and the branches extending down from them to the main trunk

and roots would correspond to the series of forms from which the living ones have arisen. As we know, the twig tips are not connected directly with one another but indirectly through the stems. A person who accuses evolutionists of teaching that one species or group of animals has risen directly from another living species or group,—modern man from the modern ape, for instance,—is just as far astray as one who should accuse them of teaching that a branch tip grows from the branch tip below it. A brief consideration should be sufficient to lay this error once and for all; but it seems to have an infinity of lives. A number of anti-evolutionists who have contributed to the recent contest make this remarkable blunder. One writer says:

> No two feathers are alike on the same bird, no two leaves alike on the same tree, no two blades of grass are alike on the ground; no two faces alike in the human race. And this is set to be so from start to finish. How then can it be said as to these particulars that they are evolved one from the other: they start together, go together and stay together. . . . If the rule is prevailing and well recognized that man is or ever was evolved from the anthropoid ape, who has ever caught one in the act, and when was it done?

And another one says this:

> The anthropoid ape of today is nearer its perfect form than thousands of years ago; and transmutation of the ape to the human—if ever possible—should be more possible now, and more credible, if possible.

These statements indicate on the part of the writers a total misapprehension of the processes of evolution. It is not merely theory but fact, demonstrated by long continued paleontological investigations, that the more highly generalized organic types are the older. Those of today are plainly diverging; and that is one excellent indication that they have in fact been connected in the past, and have diverged from a single stem.

Because of this misunderstanding, reinforced perhaps by a little of that caste feeling above mentioned, Mr. Dick introduces us to the hypothesis of Thomas Child, as presented in his work on "Root Principles", which he believes to

account for the facts upon which evolution is based much better than the theory commonly held. This, quoting Child, he sets forth as follows:

> When the Protozoa were formed from the cell, they remained Protozoa, and were not developed into Metazoa: when the Metazoa were formed, they were, like the Protozoa, produced from the single cell, were *within themselves*, passed through the Protozoa stage, and so developed into Metazoa; but when developed, were left to propagate their kind on their own plane, as were the Protozoa before them. So with the Invertebrates and Vertebrates,—passing within themselves through the whole course from the single cell upward, and taking on their passage each form in succession till their own stage, on which they remained, was reached. Thus it was with the anthropoid apes; so also with man.

This hypothesis deserves notice, if for no other reason, because it is the only alternative theory that any one of the essayists has been willing to suggest. In effect, it is merely a revised form of the doctrine of the immutability of species, except that it has taken the shape of an immutability of classes or groups. But just as it is impossible to draw a hard and fast line between species, and to distinguish species from varieties on the one side and genera on the other, so it is hard to determine the proper values of the larger divisions, such as families, orders, and classes. Then, how is Child able to tell the number of independent groups, and explain satisfactorily just where one leaves off and another begins? He can dodge some difficulties by being able to say, when he is confronted with a series of forms in which evolutionary indications are particularly strong, such as those adduced for the horse and the elephant, that they are inside one of his immutable compartments. Presumably he would so treat reptiles and birds on the strength of the feathered reptilian *Archaeopteryx*; and a similar resort is open to him every time a new find establishes new connections. But the gaps in the series of organic forms not being equivalent, it is probable that no two biologists would agree precisely on the number of major divisions which might be considered immutable, and at any time paleontological dis-

coveries could change their views entirely. Thus, as matters stand today, the divisions made to conform to this theory cannot be shown to be other than arbitrary; and as the values of the gaps are not equivalent, probability is against the validity of the hypothesis.

SPECIFIC NEW-CHURCH OBJECTIONS TO EVOLUTION.

1. *"Swedenborg affirms the truth of special creation."* —In support of this contention some writers cite a number of references, particularly those in which evil animals are mentioned, where full-fledged animal forms are represented as appearing at any time when the environment is adapted to them. Two principal citations are made: "Apocalypse Explained", n. 1201; and "Divine Love and Wisdom", nn. 339-342. Here, however, we are dealing, not with the first creation of plants and animals, but with supposed re-creation through spontaneous generation. It should be evident from "Divine Love and Wisdom", n. 341, that Swedenborg does not teach spontaneous generation as a fact, but, like all the leading naturalists of his day, accepts it as the most probable interpretation of the facts. Time has shown the fallacy of the hypothesis, which constitutes no necessary part of Swedenborg's philosophy. As to the spiritual origin of life, no question regarding it has been raised; and it should be apparent from what the writer said at the very beginning of this paper, that evolution when properly understood by no means excludes it.

One frequently cited passage, "True Christian Religion", n. 78, deserves, however, a little further notice. In a "Memorable Relation" which occupies that section, an angel says to Swedenborg: "I will now show you how all kinds of animals and vegetables were produced by God." And Swedenborg continues:

> He led me away to a broad green field, and said, "Look around". And I looked around, and saw birds of most beautiful colors, some flying, some perched upon the trees, and some scattered over the field plucking little leaves from roses. Among the birds were doves and swans. After these had disappeared from my sight, I saw not

far from me flocks of sheep with lambs, and of kids and she-goats; and round about these flocks I saw herds of cattle, young and old, also of camels and mules, and in a kind of grove, deer with high horns, and also unicorns.

When I had beheld these things the angel said, "Turn your face toward the east". And I saw a garden containing fruit trees, as orange trees, lemon trees, olive trees, vines, fig-trees, pomegranates, and also shrubs bearing berries.

The angel then said, "Look now towards the south". And I saw fields of various kinds of grain, as wheat, millet, barley, and beans; and round about them flower beds containing roses of beautifully varied colors; but toward the north I saw thick groves of chestnut trees, palms, lindens, plane trees, and other trees with rich foliage.

When I had seen these things the angel said, "All these things that you have seen are correspondences of affections of the love of the angels who are near". And he told me to what affection each particular thing corresponded; and, moreover, that not these only, but also all other things that presented themselves to their sight were correspondences, as houses, the articles of furniture in them, the tables and food, the clothing, and even the gold and silver coins, as also the diamonds and other precious stones with which wives and virgins in the heavens are adorned. "From all these things," he said, "the character of every person in respect to love and wisdom is perceived by us. The things in our houses that are of use remain there permanently; while to the sight of those who wander from one society to another these things change as their associations change. These things have been shown to enable you to see, in a special example, the entire creation. For God is love itself and wisdom itself; the affections of His love are infinite, and the perceptions of His wisdom are infinite; and of these each thing and all things that appear on earth are correspondences. This is the origin of birds and beasts, forest trees, fruit trees, crops and harvests, herbs and grasses. For God is not extended, and yet He is present through all extension, thus throughout the universe from its firsts to its lasts; and He being thus omnipresent, there are these correspondences of the affections of His love and wisdom in the whole natural world; while in our world, which is called the spiritual world, there are like correspondences with those who are receiving affections and perceptions from God. The difference is that in our world such things are created by God from moment to moment in accordance with the affections of the angels. In your world they were created in like manner in the beginning; but it was provided that they should be renewed unceasingly by the propagation of one from another, and creation be thus continued. In our

world creation is from moment to moment, and in yours continued by propagation, because the atmospheres and earths of our world are spiritual, and the atmospheres and earths of your world natural; and natural things were created to clothe spiritual things as skin clothes the bodies of men and animals, as outer and inner barks clothe the trunks and branches of trees, the several membranes clothe the brain, tunics the nerves, and the inner coats their fibers, and so on. This is why all things in your world are constant, and are renewed constantly from year to year.

The meaning of this relation is focussed in the following two sentences:

In our world such things are created by God from moment to moment in accordance with the affections of the angels. In your world they were created in like manner in the beginning; but it was provided that they should be renewed unceasingly by the propagation of one from another, and creation be thus continued in that manner.

That creation is according to correspondences no one need deny; the question is, the process by which the correspondence took place. It is impossible to interpret "in like manner" to mean that creation of organic life occurred at the beginning exactly as exhibited in the foregoing part of the relation. We might perhaps overlook the fact that animals were shown to Swedenborg before plants, and that, since he is told that artificial objects also correspond to the affections of the angels, we might suppose that they were instantaneously created in the beginning before there were any men to use them; but we cannot fail to observe that most of the animals mentioned are domesticated animals, and the plants cultivated plants. If, then, one must take this literally he has to suppose that these were created instantaneously before there were any men to domesticate the one and to cultivate the other. Nor can it be affirmed that Swedenborg is speaking of the wild ancestors of our animals and plants, because he mentions mules, which are crosses between the ass and the horse. Moreover, such a theory of creation would be flatly contradictory to Swedenborg's opinions on the subject given in "The Worship and Love of God," which some New-Churchmen very much admire.

If you are a literalist you must believe one or the other; you cannot believe both. The earlier theory will be touched upon presently. The only reasonably consistent interpretation of Swedenborg's words here—the only one which contradicts neither his philosophy nor the scientific knowledge of our day—is: (1) plants and animals in our world have their origin by correspondence with things in the world of spirit; (2) in the objective spiritual world they appear by successive mutations, and are not connected through generative processes; and (3) in the material world organisms are linked together by generative processes, but those absolutely new forms, or rather characters, which come into existence by what we call mutations, were and are created "in like manner" with organisms in the spiritual world, i.e., instantaneously. If we insist that this passage compels us to believe organic individuals or species to have been specially created, we must concede that it compels us to believe that they were created in fully developed, adult forms, for so it is represented in the relation, and we must discard Swedenborg's earlier hypothesis. The hypothesis that adult forms were instantaneously produced is one that even fundamentalists balk at, and one that such an orthodox church father as Augustine was unable to contemplate.

2. *"Science holds that both the inorganic and the organic worlds originated from simple substances, which Swedenborg denies."*—This point has been considered already. Science and Swedenborg are in entire agreement here, because, while electrons, protons, and cells are simple relative to what is made out of them, internally they are highly complex.

3. *"Scientists conceive of evolution as a continuous process along one plane, whereas creation took place from plane to plane."*—The fact is, that continuous and discrete processes are both well recognized by scientists; but evolution can take place only through the introduction of differences, and hence passes necessarily from plane to plane. This is very neatly illustrated by Mr. Cutler, as follows:

An adult individual develops or evolves from an infant all in accordance with natural laws; so a child develops or evolves from his parents all in accordance with the same natural laws. But in the former case there is a continuous change, but no change in identity, while in the latter case a new individual is evolved, analogous to a new species; or as we should say in the language of Swedenborg, a discrete degree has been formed. In both cases from the outer view-point one form was produced from the other; yet from the inner and truer view-point we must believe that life from God flowing down according to law created the later form through the earlier one.

Inorganic substances are present in plant and animal organisms alike. The objective basis of life, protoplasm, is present throughout plants and animals, but is not found as such in the mineral kingdom. The vertebrate structural plan appears with fishes, and is present in all higher orders,—amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals, and man; and other differences are introduced and continued from various levels. These are not mere quantitative differences; they come from the life force or soul. At least they may be interpreted to do so, and there is no scientific proof to the contrary. As we ascend the evolutionary ladder, the changes seem to be more interior and less tangible, but are equally apparent in their effects. And when we come to man, the intangible, super-physical nature of the difference is most marked of all. In their frantic endeavors to prove man physically distinct from apes, theologians of an earlier generation curiously enough overlooked the very strongest weapon in their armory bearing on the superiority of man to ape. Mr. Rabone has grasped this important point, which he phrases thus:

If then the origin of the body of man from one of the apes is a practical certainty, because of the structural *likeness* between them, it is equally certain, from the radical *unlikeness* between the two types of mind, that in this respect they cannot be traced back to the same common origin.

It would have been more nearly correct to say, "If community of origin of apes and man on the physical side is a practical certainty". Otherwise the observation is very much

to the point, and should be drilled thoroughly into the minds of religious and non-religious students of evolution alike.

Neo-Darwinism and Neo-Lamarckism.

Most non-New-Church contributors to the contest confined themselves to attempts to prove that there is no necessary conflict between evolution in general and religious belief in general; but Mr. McLane, who identifies selectionism with evolution, tries to show that that particular interpretation of the hypothesis is not inconsistent with belief. Singularly enough, one of the strongest anti-evolutionary New-Church contributors, Dr. Dick, accepts the selectionist theory without question.

This form of evolution, which is that professed more particularly by the Neo-Darwinian school, recognizes two principal factors: accidental or chance variations; and natural selection. Variations between plants and animals of the same species or the same variety are known to occur. It is assumed that some of these are better fitted than others to a certain environment, and that, since more individual organisms are produced than there is room for, the environment will preserve the fit organisms and destroy the rest. When this theory was originally proposed, next to nothing was known about variations. It is now recognized that some variations are not transmitted, and that certain others do not involve any possibility of evolutionary advance. Again, certain forms with unfavorable characters may continue evolving regardless of their environment. Paleontological studies seem to show series of forms proceeding along definite lines, indicating that changes have been persistently in one direction, and not in a hesitating or zigzag manner, as would be the case if external selection were the main directive force. The strength of the hypothesis is best manifested where varieties or closely related species are found in adjoining geographical areas that furnish different environmental conditions. It is there evident that there has been a connection between environment and form, though the exact nature of it is still uncertain. But when we apply the theory

to organic life taken as a whole, difficulties present themselves. In a single square mile we may find representatives of all the major classes and orders of plants and animals, and we must suppose that all, from bottom to top, have survived because they were the best fitted for the region in question. But if, for instance, the many-celled organisms survived because they were superior to the one-celled organisms, either the one-celled organisms should have died out in competition with the others, or, what amounts to the same thing, they should have evolved along with them. On the contrary, the one-celled are as successful as the many-celled forms, and they are vastly more numerous. Therefore, if fitness to survive determined evolution, there seems to be no reason why many-celled beings should ever have come into existence. The same argument would hold as between the invertebrates and vertebrates, mammals and reptiles, and numerous other subdivisions of these several groups. Another weakness is the premise, that variations occur by chance. Darwin was well aware of this. Nevertheless, he and his successors went on to treat them as if such were the case, whereas the assumption is opposed to scientific probability, since, so far as we know, nature is not haphazard; and if mutations in fact take place in accordance with law, the effects of natural selection will be largely checkmated. It is probable that organisms are equipped with means for adapting themselves in some degree to external conditions; but there is no reason to think that this flexibility is unlimited, or that such organisms are, as selectionists assume, mere passive victims of their surroundings. Pure selectionism is repugnant to any religious-minded person, (1) because it tends to replace direction by chance, and (2) because it attributes to environment—and in the last analysis this means inorganic matter—a controlling power over mind. Viewed, however, merely as an accessory force, as most biologists in fact do now view it, it falls into an understandable and appropriate place in the order of things. Only the religious-minded man will go farther than the

scientist; he will maintain that the environment, no less than the organism, is subject to Divine law.

Another essayist, Mr. Small, though he does not elaborate the scientific aspects of the question as carefully as the last mentioned writer, decidedly favors the other leading evolutionary hypothesis, that which takes its name from Lamarck. According to this theory, instead of being the passive victims of inherited variations within and the environment without, organisms determine the course of evolution by their own efforts. Not that they will to evolve, but that they react to their environment in such a way that certain organs are developed by use, and others become atrophied by disuse. It is assumed that these tendencies will be transmitted to succeeding generations, and in time will produce changes resulting in varieties of form as great as those which organisms now exhibit. While this seems plausible, geneticists have hitherto been unable to obtain any positive proof of "the inheritance of acquired characters" on which the entire theory hangs, and it has therefore fallen into proportional discredit. It may be agreed that the germ plasm is difficult to alter; and this is probably fortunate; otherwise every unborn child would be at the absolute mercy of its parents, and all of us would be playthings of every change in latitude, and perhaps every change in season. At the same time it seems incredible that a succession of organisms could be immersed in a given environment for a long period without undergoing some sort of alteration with reference to it; and in fact not a few biologists refuse to give up the principle as a whole. We believe instinctively that the influences of our surroundings, particularly those to which we voluntarily submit ourselves, do have a transmissible effect upon us. Certainly "the fall of man", as apart from the fall of individual men, would be impossible unless the sins of the fathers, as well as their virtues, have some effect on their descendants. Mr. Small is, therefore, quite right in his positive stand on Lamarckism, though his confidence in the work of Kammerer is unfortunately misplaced.

Constructive Suggestions Regarding the Evolutionary Process.

New-Church contributors favorably disposed toward evolution make certain suggestions regarding the nature and method of the process, drawn from Swedenborg's writings. Mr. Hartley deals particularly with the philosophical system contained in Swedenborg's earlier works, and Mr. Edmiston makes use of the so-called theological writings, with equal effect. Unquestionably Swedenborg entered upon his later career with the main principles of his early cosmogonic system firmly in mind. And unquestionably that was a distinctly evolutionary system, and one of great beauty, deserving the admiration of all students of the history of human thought. But while the particular thought-frame through which he entered upon his seership naturally excites our respect and is worthy of close study, it is unlikely that any one man could ever be led to a complete and perfect understanding of the manner in which our universe was unfolded. We shall rather discover that the deeper principles to which he was led will find a more and more perfect realization as science advances.

1. *Creation is continuous, not merely initial.*—This principle has received less attention than it deserves. It is covered by the well-known New-Church aphorism that "sustentation is perpetual creation," of which Mr. Hartley and one or two others remind us. The principle has kept contributors belonging to our Church from an error common to certain others, who, if the scientist will grant that God set the evolutionary process at work in the very beginning, are willing to ignore anything that may happen to it afterward. Thus, when Mr. McLane has done this very thing, he thinks that he has reconciled evolution with religion. He says:

> A clockmaker who having made a clock has to make its hands go by moving them himself, and makes it strike by himself striking its bell, is not so great a clockmaker as he who, having made a clock sets it going, with the sure knowledge that it will go without losing or gaining time, and that it will itself strike at every hour. If he could make a clock that could regulate and repair itself, and

that could produce from itself other clocks just like itself, he would be the kind of "clockmaker" that God is. If, having made a clock and set it going in the knowledge that it would regulate and repair itself and reproduce a supply of other clocks, he could further know these clocks could through the course of time develop into more and more complicated clocks, some capable of running in arctic weather and some in tropic, some in calm, clear weather and some in sandstorms, then he would be the kind of clockmaker that the evolutionist must conclude that God is.

But, if God had chosen to construct such a self-sufficient world, is it not evident that there would no longer be need of Him? He might then have annihilated Himself, while His wonderful mechanism went on and on endlessly. Rather He is the kind of clockmaker who loves the work of his hands so utterly that he must keep in constant touch with it. Creation as above described would deserve the judgment that Mr. Small passes upon creation by fiat: that it "is itself atheistic, since it thinks of God as working apart from nature's laws, so that nature is left without a God because without vital connection with the One source of life".

2. *The evolution of animals through plants.*—In his earlier writings, particularly "The Worship and Love of God", Swedenborg suggests an origin for animals through plants, not as is now believed a separation of the animal and plant kingdoms when both were represented by minute, single-celled forms, but the production of the various species of higher animal forms from higher vegetable forms. He was led to this theory by observing the dependence of animals on plants, and the dependence of certain animals, such as insects, certain birds, and even mammals and snails, on particular species of plants. That he was groping toward the truth is shown by a passage in which he says:

> These seeds or beginnings lay as yet unseparated in their rudiments, one folded up in another, namely the vegetable kingdom in the mineral kingdom, which was to be the matrix, and the animal kingdom in the vegetable kingdom, which was to serve as a nurse or nourisher; for each was afterward to come forth distinctly from its covering. (Worship and Love of God, n. 15.)

In early geologic times plants must, indeed, have formed

a powerful element in that environment by which, or in accordance with which, animal life took its various known forms. Therefore, even though the animal did not spring out of the vegetable, the form which the animal took was due in large measure to the vegetable.

3. *Higher planes of animal life may have come through parthenogenetic reproduction from females of lower planes.* —Messrs. Small and Rabone lay stress upon this possibility, which is founded on Swedenborg's treatment of the Incarnation and his accompanying teaching that the more interior part of a human being is derived from the father. Assuming that evolution had reunion with the Deity through the Incarnation and Ascension as its object, the query is raised why a similar process may not have taken place in the lower orders of life. As the human was raised to a level with the Divine through implantation of a Divine soul in the virgin mother, why may not the animal have been raised to the human level through implantation of a human soul in some female animal, the implantation perhaps taking the form of a mutation within the mother and resulting in parthenogenetically produced offspring? And if this happened twice, it may have happened many times in the course of organic evolution. The first mammal may have come into existence parthenogenetically; so too the first vertebrate, the first multiple-celled organism. However, parthenogenesis as known to science is of certain well recognized types, and does not involve the introduction of new characters by mutation. On the contrary organisms originating in this manner exhibit fewer variations than those which come about through bisexual processes. They are divided into two classes, one of which produces only females, the other only males. Parthenogenetic reproduction capable of originating new classes of animals, such as vertebrates or mammals, must have been markedly different. It would necessitate drawing upon something entirely new within or without nature to bring about the variation.

Whether there be two parents or one, evolution means the

introduction of some new character, either from an outside source or through the awakening of a latent internal power. Ordinarily this makes its appearance in conjunction with reproduction participated in by two parents; but as it is independent of both, there is no reason why it might not appear in the female alone. As we learn more of mutations, more light may be expected on this point.

The Ultimate Cause of Evolution.

As indicated in a previous quotation, Swedenborg represents material creation as the ultimation of things pre-existing in the world of spirit, which in the last analysis are from the Divine Being. This is mentioned by several New-Church contributors, some of whom regard the process as incompatible with evolution, while others, such as Messrs. Edmiston and Small, find no difficulty in harmonizing the two conceptions, evolution being interpretable as the action of creation in time. Others experience a difficulty in conceiving of organisms corresponding to thoughts and affections as evolving, the argument being that each thought or affection is distinct and cannot be merged in anything else. But this is only an aspect of that peculiarly obstinate misunderstanding of the nature of the evolutionary process to which I have already referred, one which short-circuits it from one living form to another instead of allowing for gradual divergence in the course of ages. As we have seen, evolution does not act in this manner. The theory teaches that the more generalized types precede and give birth to specialized types. The process is analogous to the division of labor in the industrial world. Lumbering, for instance, started when one man cut down a tree, made it into lumber, and fitted the lumber into a house. It grew into an industry in which gangs of men performed each of these functions; indeed in which each kind of lumber was handled by means of diverse machines and by different bodies of workers. Division of labor proceeds from generals to particulars. Such, we understand, is the specialization in the heavens. When the first human beings passed into the first heavens,

there is every reason to believe that they corresponded to very generalized types of thought and affection; but that, as the numbers multiplied, division of labor, or refinement of correspondence, took place. Far from proving to be irreconcilable, modern scientists and Swedenborg agree excellently. It is no mere accident that Huxley and Swedenborg both likened the evolutionary or unfolding process to the development of an egg. An egg does not contain merely the feet or the head of an organism to which the other parts are progressively added. It has germs of all those parts which in course of time differentiate out of it. All evidence points to the same general process in organic evolution, in the evolution of human societies, in the evolution of angelic societies; and this type of evolution contains no difficulties for one who believes that creation took place by correspondences.

Animals Were Evolved from Man.

In the last analysis, as stated in the last section, material things exist by correspondence with things in the Divine Being; and since He is the Perfect Human, we are led to the conclusion not merely that mind preceded matter but that from a perfect human form all things of the world, both inorganic and organic, came. If we see in the later stages of evolution—those best known to us—an evolution toward the human form, we must at the same time recognize that still earlier there was an evolution out of the human form, or, as it is sometimes put, an involution. The inevitable conclusion that, interiorly considered, "animal was evolved from man, not man from animal", is the one great thought our anonymous essayist contributes to the discussion.

Evolution's Goal.

Some writers compare what Swedenborg has to say regarding early man with the findings of biologists and anthropologists. Mr. Edmiston reminds us of his statement that primitive men at first "lived like wild animals, but at

length became spiritual men", and then celestial men. Mr. Martin also touches upon the subject. But it is treated most luminously by Miss Spiers. In one place she cites the statement, significant for its evolutionary bearings, that "it is evident that the erect attitude of the body is not natural, but artificial, and has been learned by process of time, and confirmed by custom" (Spiritual Diary, n. 567). In the following paragraphs she goes into the whole question more thoroughly:

> It is an interesting speculation as to whether some of these "pre-Adamites", whom Swedenborg describes as being "external men", with "but little spiritual life", stating as definitely as the evolutionist does that the most ancient people lived like wild animals (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 286), may not have been those into whom the Lord gradually infused something of spiritual life, until finally there were some who became celestial men, and of these the Most Ancient Church was formed. There is no necessity for believing that they were highly civilized. If a man of the Most Ancient Church were to appear among us today, we should probably consider him a harmless, gentle, and perhaps even stupid savage—stupid, because we, with our different approach to spiritual things, would be unable to enter into his processes of thought, to understand the interior wisdom of a man who knew no life but that of love to the Lord and his neighbor.
>
> "Those who lived in that most ancient time," says Swedenborg, "were of a native quality quite different from anything that exists with anyone of this day" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 200). Perhaps these men were of the genus *Homo Neanderthalensis*, who, scientists tell us, were of a different species from any man now existing. Swedenborg says that they thought differently (their wills and understandings being one, possibly their brains were also differently formed); spoke differently (inarticulately, which is of interest in view of the almost chinlessness of Neanderthal man); and breathed differently. Moreover, their posterity perished by a kind of "suffocation" (*Ibid.*, n. 560), and fossil remains seem to indicate that *Homo Neanderthalensis* went out of existence almost suddenly. However, too little is yet known about them to warrant our going very far in such speculation.

Naturally, the correspondence between collective human history and individual regeneration has not escaped our clerical essayists. Mr. Gould leads our thought upward in

his usual lucid manner, through "the animal stage", "the level of reason", and "the level of love", towards "evolution's goal", which he defines as follows:

> As man grows to the conscious love of his Creator, the Divine cycle of life which we have learned to call evolution is complete. For this—that there might be other personalities whom He could love and who could return His love—God "in the beginning created the heavens and the earth". And yet, as we now know, He did this, not instantaneously or once for all, but by ordered steps and stages, leaving always unlimited room for further growth and progress. Neither man nor the universe can ever be finished; rather it is life's chief glory and inspiration that it moves forever toward an infinite perfection which—being itself finite—it can never reach. That man evolved *from* animal is true with the qualifications we have sought to outline; but what really matters is that he may, now and forever, as far as he chooses go on and evolve *toward* God.

Summary.

To answer adequately the question "Was man evolved from animal?" contributors to the Tract Society contest found themselves compelled to consider in some measure the entire subject of evolution, and therefore our discussion of them is necessarily expanded in like proportions. They also became involved in two rather different questions, both, however, of great interest: (1) "Are the minimum demands of the evolutionary hypothesis irreconcilable with religious belief?"; and (2) "May not the evolutionary process have a deeper meaning that will adequately account for its more evident phenomena and render certain extensions highly probable?"

It was found that much opposition to evolution is due to lack of a clear and well-understood definition of the theory; and an endeavor was made to supply this. The principal objections to the hypothesis not of a strictly New-Church character were as follows: (1) "Evolution is not proved"; (2) "Evolution is humiliating to man"; (3) "Evolution endangers religious faith, because (a) it is irreconcilable with the Biblical story of origins, and (b) it is a form of materialism"; and (4) "Evolution is contradicted by the evidence".

The first of these was countered by showing that other hypotheses are accepted unquestioningly on evidence no better than that asserted to be inadequate to establish evolution. The second was shown to be rooted less in anxiety for the real nobility of man than in self-pride. Opposition on Biblical grounds was found to be unwarranted except for the die-hard literalist whose very literalism involves him in perpetual contradictions. Imputation of materialism was shown to arise from a total misunderstanding of the assumed evolutionary process; and the very same misunderstanding was discovered at the root of the fourth contention.

Three specifically New-Church objections make their appearance: (1) the assertion that Swedenborg accepted the doctrine of special creation; (2) the assertion that science traces all things to simple substances,—a theory specifically denied by Swedenborg; and (3) the assertion that the scientific form of evolution represents the process as continuous along one plane, whereas creation must have passed from plane to plane.

The reply to the first of these is, that Swedenborg's statements upon which the assertion is based have evidently been misinterpreted, since they are at variance with what he says elsewhere, and cannot be accepted literally in any case; whereas, properly understood, they involve a great truth in no way at variance with evolution. The second and third objections are shown to be due to misunderstandings of the scientific position on the points involved.

Among the essayists under consideration, one treats the whole subject from the selectionist or Neo-Darwinian standpoint, while another emphasizes Neo-Lamarckian factors. The reply to the first is that natural selection is not the sole evolutionary factor, nor a primary one; and that it is now held in less esteem than formerly, but performs a minor function that need disturb nobody's faith. On the other hand we are still awaiting good genetic evidence of "the inheritance of acquired characters", on which Neo-Lamarckism is founded; but that germ cells are susceptible

to transmissible changes on the part of environmental influences when continued sufficiently long, appears to be a necessary supposition.

Constructive attempts to suggest modifications of the evolutionary theory are made by some of the New-Church writers, based sometimes on Swedenborg's earlier writings and sometimes upon his later works. All attempts of this kind, when properly controlled, are justifiable; but those who undertake them should be warned that everything in the "frame" of seventeenth century science by means of which Swedenborg communicated his principles need not be considered valid today.

Specific suggestions by New-Church contributors are as follows: (1) that creation is present and ever-recurring, not merely past and initial; (2) that particular orders and species of plants may have exerted a powerful influence in the evolution of particular orders and species of animals; (3) that higher planes of animal life may have resulted form parthenogenetic reproduction from females of lower planes.

The first of these is a great truth often overlooked even by those who esteem themselves religious; and there is nothing in evolution out of harmony with it. The second is taken mainly from Swedenborg's "Worship and Love of God". In the literal sense in which it is there set forth it is inacceptable; but it is nevertheless true that the particular forms which many animals take are profoundly determined by certain plants. The third is suggested by the Incarnation. As extended to animal life, it does not seem to be borne out by known types of parthenogenesis, but it may prove true none the less. However, progressive evolutionary changes are, in fact, inherited from neither parent, except as the potencies may have been hidden in them; therefore, whether they come through one or through both, they are equally creative rather than evolutionary effects.

The ultimate cause of evolution is different from and above the process itself, but it has naturally been touched

upon by some clerical contributors. This operates by immediate correspondence of the "new" material thing with its spiritual counterpart. Back of all, however, is the Mind which gives unity and diversity, and which is the Human in its essence. But if creation had its origin in this Human, it follows that minerals, plants, and animals are indeed evolved from man, although superficially the mineral seems to be the starting point. This is because what we call evolution is the entire creative process expressed in time, with the first and last chapters omitted.

The last chapters lead us through the animal-like man to the more and more perfect man and to the Incarnation, the return of Life to Life. Anthropology and history show us the external side of this human evolution. Swedenborg, under the captions of the Most Ancient, Ancient, Jewish, Christian, and New Christian Churches, and the inner and inmost correspondences of these, tells us of the internal side of evolution; and when this is clearly understood, there are no inconsistencies between the two.

In the foregoing discussion the present writer has been guided in part by the selected papers submitted in competition; but it has also been necessary for him to guide the discussion in order to produce a coherent study. The answers to the first question which our essayists have set themselves, consciously or unconsciously, would appear to be that, when the theory of evolution is properly understood, there is no conflict between it and religious faith; and the answer to the second by New-Church contributors, that evolution is in reality part of a great and sacred process by means of which Essential Humanity has been and still is creating and continuing the universe. Therefore, man is evolved from animal; but this is only an appearance behind which lies the greater reality, that both are alike evolved from the Essential Man, toward Whom, as Mr. Gould happily adds, man is still evolving.

JOHN R. SWANTON, PH. D.

MATERIALS FOR AN ESTIMATE OF SWEDENBORG'S HISTORICAL POSITION AND INFLUENCE. IV.

With Notes and Comments by the Rev. Lewis F. Hite.

THE present paper—the fourth and concluding one of the series—will complete our presentation of impressions and opinions about Swedenborg in the circle of his personal acquaintances, so far as found in printed records. It will be devoted exclusively to John Christian Cuno, a gentleman of Amsterdam.

After varied experience as a student and soldier, John Christian Cuno settled down in his early thirties as a merchant and banker at Amsterdam. His acquaintance with Swedenborg began November 4, 1768, and continued from that time until April, 1769, and again from September, 1770, to August, 1771. During this time their intercourse seems to have been frequent and friendly.

Cuno was a man of literary tastes and ability. He was an orthodox Lutheran, and was interested in the development of religious ideas as well as religious practices. The record of his impressions of Swedenborg is one of the most interesting and valuable that has come down to us. In a very vivid and striking way it shows the wonderment and perplexity of mind produced by Swedenborg's claims and writings. It reflects the natural resentment against religious innovations, especially those of a fundamental kind; and it reflects still more the natural incredulity and indignation with which such extraordinary and amazing claims were received. It is much to his credit, and moreover it is highly significant, that he withholds final judgment. He seems to have been influenced in this, not only by the inherent difficulty of passing judgment upon such a case, but also by the singularly and completely favorable impression made by Swedenborg's personality. Nowhere is the simplicity, direct-

ness, transparency, and winsomeness of that personality so charmingly portrayed.

The record is contained in Cuno's autobiography, and was written down while the events were still fresh in mind. It is therefore more than usually trustworthy. In addition to this record, there are three letters: one to Swedenborg incorporated in the record; and two to friends in Hamburg, which were made public at the time, and in this way circulated.*

From the Autobiography of John Christian Cuno (1708-1780?).

"I must remain faithful to a promise made last year, and begin by giving an account of the most singular saint who has ever lived, Mr. Emanuel Swedenborg. As nothing con-

**Bibliographical Note.*—The following matter by Cuno is taken from Tafel's "Documents", Vol. 2, pp. 443-485.—Document 256.

Cuno's "Autobiography" fell into the hands of Dr. August Scheler, royal librarian in Brussels, who copied the part about Swedenborg, and published it in an octavo volume of 172 pages under the title of *Aufzeichnungen eines Amsterdamer Burgers über Swedenborg*, Hanover, 1858. From this Dr. Tafel made his translation for the "Documents", 1877. It seems that the "Autobiography" as a whole has never been translated. The complete translation is a desideratum of historical importance. Cuno, as he says, copied the letter to Swedenborg into his "Autobiography", and also circulated it privately among his friends. The letter was written partly in self-defense, to ward off the impression that he was a heretic; it was also written to press real difficulties he had with Swedenborg's claims and certain points of his doctrine.

This letter, along with the two written to the Hamburg friends, was published in 1771 in pamphlet form with the title *Sammlung einiger Nachrichten Herrn Emanuel Swedenborg und desselben vorgegebenen Umgang mit Geisterreich betreffend*. This pamphlet was incorporated by F. C. Oetinger in his collection of Swedenborg documents, entitled *Schwedische Urkunden*, whence it was taken by Dr. Im. Tafel for use in his collection; and from this it passed to the English editions of the "Documents". In Tafel's collection, and consequently in the English editions, they appear in a more or less abridged form. A copy of the original edition of this pamphlet is in the Academy Library, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

cerns me more in this world than the worship of God, and as I found interspersed in the last work of that man such strange and singular things, I was naturally impelled by an irresistible curiosity to make the acquaintance of the author. On reading the beginning of this book, which like all his other works is written in Latin, and which bears the title, 'The Delights of Wisdom concerning Conjugial Love: after which follow The Pleasures of Insanity concerning Scortatory Love', I could not think otherwise than that its author was insane. Curiosity, however, induced me to read on, and occasionally I found him uttering such thoughtful things, as I had never before heard from academical desks and pulpits, and which never before had entered my thoughts.

"I submit to the judgment of my readers, what we ought to think concerning a man, who begins his preliminary chapter on the joys of heaven and nuptials there in these words: 'I am aware that many who read the following pages, and the Memorable Relations annexed to the chapters, will believe that they are fictions of the imagination; but I protest in truth that they are not fictions, but were truly done and seen; not seen in any state of the mind asleep, but in a state of full wakefulness: for it has pleased the Lord to manifest Himself to me, and to send me to teach the things relating to the New Church, which is meant by the New Jerusalem in the Revelation: for which purpose he has opened the interiors of my mind and spirit; whereby it has been granted me to be in the spiritual world with angels, and at the same time in the natural world with men, and this now for twenty-five years.' Such an unexpected assertion, which has never been made by any man before, would be sufficient to induce any intelligent reader to throw the entire work under his chair. . . . Still we should wrong Swedenborg very much by charging him with want of clearness. His style is very simple, clear, and intelligible; sometimes indeed his descriptions are so full of details and so

picturesque, that they could easily be painted, and represented in interesting pictures. . . .

"The learned Mr. Swedenborg cannot be classed among freethinkers and enemies of the Christian religion; for he writes with the greatest reverence for God and His Word. He has impressed upon me the most profound reverence for the adorable Savior of the world, and his entire system of doctrine is based upon His Divinity. Although, on the other hand, his writings contain many evident errors, so that he must be classed among the heretics, I nevertheless cannot discover in him so very easily those motives by which most heretics are carried away. Those who know this man, and desire to judge of him without prejudice, may indeed declare him to be somewhat eccentric in his habits and his mode of living, yet they cannot charge him with anything wrong or disorderly. I scarcely believe that he has any enemies; at all events he could not have made them by the innocent, even sainted, tenor of his life; and should he have them, it would be impossible for them, as well as for the scoffers who examine closely all modes of life different from their own, to discover anything in him which they could justly find fault with, or even calumniate. Before making his more intimate acquaintance, I inquired most particularly after these points especially among the Swedish merchants, among whom there was one of his countrymen, Mr. Joachim Wretman, whom I could trust as imbued with Christianity, and a man of intelligence.

"My first acquaintance with him dates from November 4, 1768, when I happened to meet him in the French book-shop of Mr. François Changuion. The old gentleman speaks both French and High German, yet not very readily. Besides, he is afflicted with the natural infirmity of stuttering; yet at one time more than at another. Our first meeting was pleasing and sympathetic. He permitted me to call upon him at his own house; which I did on the following Sunday, and I continued to do so almost every Sunday, after attending church in the morning. He lodged near our old church in

Calf-street *(Kälbergasse)*, where he had engaged two comfortable rooms. One of my first questions was, whether he had no male attendant to wait upon him in his old age, and to accompany him on his journeys? He answered that he needed no one to look after him, because his angel was ever with him, and conversed and had intercourse with him. If another man had uttered these words, he would have made me laugh; but I never thought of laughing when this venerable man, eighty-one years old, told me this; he looked far too innocent, and when he gazed upon me with his smiling blue eyes, which he always did in conversing with me, it was as if truth itself was speaking from them.

"I often noticed with surprise how scoffers, who had made their way into large societies where I had taken him, and whose purpose it had been to make fun of the old gentleman, forgot all their laughter and their intended scoffing, and how they stood agape and listened to the most singular things which he, like an open-hearted child, told about the spiritual world without reserve, and with full confidence. It almost seemed as if his eyes possessed the faculty of imposing silence on every one.

"He lived with simple burgher folks, who kept a shop in which they sold chintz, muslin, handkerchiefs, and the like, and who had quite a number of little children. I inquired of the landlady whether the old gentleman did not require very much attention. She answered, 'He scarcely requires any; the servant has nothing else to do for him, except in the morning to lay the fire for him in the fireplace. Every evening he goes to bed at seven, and gets up in the morning at eight. We do not trouble ourselves any more about him. During the day he keeps up the fire himself; and on going to bed takes great care, lest the fire should do any damage. He dresses and undresses himself alone, and waits upon himself in every thing, so that we scarcely know whether there is any one in the house or not. I should like him to be with us during the rest of his life. My children will miss him most; for he never goes out without bringing them

home some sweets; the little rogues also dote upon the old gentleman so much, that they prefer him to their own parents. I imagine, that he is very rich.'

"This last remark of the good lady must be very true; and we may infer it from this circumstance alone, that he has published his manifold writings in England and in this country entirely at his own expense; and has never gained a farthing from their sale. All these writings are printed on large and expensive paper; and yet he gives them all away. . . .

"He has himself lived very frugally. Chocolate and biscuits served in his own room usually constituted his dinner; and of this his landlord, his landlady, and the children generally received the greater part. If he had a better appetite, he went into a neighboring restaurant in the so-called 'holy way'; and this after much inquiry I learned from himself only a short time before his departure. He was far from being misanthropical and obstinate. Whoever invited him to his house was sure to have him. In addition to Messrs. Hope & Co., who were his bankers, he sometimes dined with his countrymen, the Messrs. Grill, and others. With Mr. Wretman he dined almost every Sunday; he also was his most intimate companion.

"When I first invited Swedenborg to my house, I extended the invitation also to Mr. Wretman. I might have invited many more; for many were anxious to make the acquaintance of so singular a guest; but, as I was not yet sufficiently acquainted with him myself, I did not venture to invite more; for I was continually afraid that some one would make sport of him. He was in very good spirits at my house, and uncommonly frank and open-hearted, as I have always found him since. . . .

"It soon became known in town that I associated with this remarkable man; and everybody troubled me to give them an opportunity of making his acquaintance. I advised the people to do as I had done, and to call upon him, because he willingly conversed with every honest man. Mr. Sweden-

borg moves in the world with great tact, and knows how to address the high, as well as the low. I should have liked very much to introduce him into our club, because he told me that he was fond occasionally of playing a game of l'hombre; but as I knew that he did not stop anywhere after seven, and as no High German and only very little French is spoken in our circle, I had to give it up. For the same reason I could not gratify the wishes of some curious ladies.

"Once, however, at the urgent request of the wife of my friend Mr. Nicolam Konauw, I agreed to bring him to dinner. The old gentleman consented, and was prepared at once to go. Mr. Konauw sent his carriage for us. On presenting ourselves to Madame we found among other guests the two Misses Hoog, who had been highly educated, and had been introduced, beyond the common sphere of woman, into the higher, especially the philosophical, sciences. Mr. Swedenborg's deportment was exquisitely refined and gallant. When dinner was announced, I offered my hand to the hostess, and quickly our young man of eighty-one years had put on his gloves, and presented his hand to Mademoiselle Hoog, in doing which he looked uncommonly well. Whenever he was invited out, he dressed properly and becomingly in black velvet; but ordinarily he wore a brown coat and black trousers. I never saw him dressed otherwise than in one of these two suits of clothes. Our old gentleman was seated between Madame Konauw and the elder Demoiselle Hoog, both of whom understood thoroughly well how to talk; but they had to promise me beforehand, that, at least during dinner, they would allow the old gentleman to eat in peace. This promise they kept faithfully, and he seemed to enjoy very much to be so attentively served by the ladies. This time he displayed such a good appetite, that I was quite surprised. They could not prevail on him to take more than three glasses of wine, which were besides half filled with sugar, of which he was more than ordinarily fond. During the dessert the talking went on very freely, and it continued afterwards while we

took tea and coffee, and thus uninterruptedly until seven o'clock, when I had taken care that the carriage should be ready to take us home. It is astonishing what a number of questions the ladies addressed to him; all of which he answered. I should have to write a great deal, were I inclined to write down all these questions and answers. . . .

"In respect to Mr. Swedenborg's external appearance, he is for his years a perfect wonder of health. He is of middle stature, and although he is more than twenty years older than I am, I should be afraid to run a race with him; for he is as quick on his legs as the youngest man. . . .

"If any one desire to have an idea of Swedenborg's looks, he will find his portrait in his work entitled, *Emanuelis Swedenborgii Opera philosophica et Mineralia. Tres tomi in folio, Dresdae et Lipsiae Sumptibus Frederici Hekelii, Bibliopolae regii.* MDCCXXXIV; which portrait, although finished forty years ago by the skilful engraver Bernigroth, is still perfectly like him, especially in respect to the eyes, which have retained their beauty, even in his old age.

"On the 24th of April of this year [1769] he departed for Paris with the intention of remaining there for some time, and afterwards of going to London, whence he intends to embark for Sweden. . . .

"In respect to his 'Revelation Revealed' or *Apocalypsis Revelata*, Amsterdam, 1764, I am astonished that the theologians of every denomination keep silence about it, and allow this man to write everything he chooses, as long as the day lasts. We can easily comprehend why the Protestants should not object to his saying anything he pleases about the destruction of Babel and the Babylonian whore, because all that is set forth on this subject is also applied by others to Rome and popery; but the Protestants themselves are not treated better by him: for the apocalyptic dragon is with him an emblem of the Protestants. Man being saved by faith alone without the works of the Law he calls unhesitatingly a draconic doctrine; and against this he declaims as much as against the Babylonian whore. Faith and

love, according to him, must be married, else faith is a mere matter of the imagination and a nonentity. *Herein he is perfectly right.* . . . For my own part I cannot regard our seer otherwise than as a pious, honest man, of whom I cannot believe that he could possibly tell a deliberate falsehood. . . .

"In this very same work Mr. Swedenborg displays very great learning, and it is difficult to reconcile how a man who at best may be called a spiritual hypochondriac, is able to utter such profound things as nobody has ever before thought of. . . . It cannot be denied that innumerable explanations and interpretations of the Apocalypse have been printed, which are all contradictory to one another. Mr. Swedenborg states as the reason of this, that the spiritual sense of that work has been heretofore unknown. This is certainly worth hearing. But if I should admit, that he is the first mortal to whom this sense has been discovered, and that it is his immediate mission to communicate these new discoveries to the world, I can the less believe it, as his discoveries contain so much that is manifestly contradictory. Of this I will give only one instance: He asserts in the driest manner, that the last judgment must no longer be expected, but that it has already taken place in the world of spirits in 1757. This I found asserted in clear and distinct words in the above work, where he referred to a separate treatise entitled: 'The Last Judgment and the Destruction of Babylon.' . . .

"I at least am willing, nay constrained to confess, that he has said many things of which I had never thought. No scholar, at least not one versed in natural science, will doubt Mr. Swedenborg's science. It does not seem to me sufficient, that a theologian who, from pride or indolence, is not willing to examine his works, should shout with a loud voice with Festus (Acts xxvi, 24), Swedenborg is beside himself, much learning has made him mad; what wisdom can be expected from a madman; or that others, who like to be considered as faithful watchmen on the walls of Zion,

should say superciliously, 'The good that Swedenborg has said is old, and all the new which he says is good for nothing.' I admit that a good deal of this may be true; still if the theologians, whose vocation it is to examine and defend the truth, had acted conscientiously and honestly, they would not have kept silence so long, and they would not have allowed this man to write unchallenged all these things, which may be true or untrue. I have listened to the judgment of many men concerning Swedenborg. Some, especially such as knew the character of this intrinsically amiable man, have pitied him; others have called him a visionary. A certain young scholar, who had only read his treatise *De Amore conjugiali*, was inclined to consider him a Socinian. I could very easily convince him that he had but turned over the leaves of his book, and had read it without reflection. If ever there has been a zealous Anti-Arian and Anti-Socinian, that man without doubt is Emanuel Swedenborg."

Cuno's Letter to Swedenborg (March 8, 1769).

"To the Most Learned and Celebrated Mr. Emanuel Swedenborg.

"I have read your works, and especially the brief treatise lately published, where I have carefully noted what seemed to me novel and paradoxical. As I have nothing more at heart than religion and Christian truth, I deemed it worth my while, not only to read your writings cursorily, but also to examine and try them to the best of my ability. I cannot deny that I have found in them much that is worthy of attention. They are refulgent with beauties; but I likewise became aware of many blemishes. I am willing either to keep silence, or to ask you to indulge my freedom in addressing you. For it is my custom either to be silent, or, when summoned to speak, to tell the truth; but you are accustomed to listen graciously: for, according to Pliny, those who are most willing to hear of their faults, deserve most to be praised. . . .

"I have closely examined the basis of your system. Its

chief authority are the things you testify to have seen. You relate wonderful things you have seen and heard. You desire to inform the world that it is granted to you to be at the same time in the spiritual world with angels, and in the natural world with men. You talk of great things, which the incredulous world is unwilling to believe. . . .

"The Dutch have only noticed your work, the last but one, treating on 'Conjugial Love,' and they reviewed it with great judgment and praiseworthy moderation. The Amsterdam critic suspended his judgment until the work on *the new doctrine in its fulness,* which was promised within two years, should make its appearance. He says, 'We expect, therefore, in time a more ample explanation. Meanwhile, according to my opinion, the theologians may without danger be spared the trouble of refuting the ideas of this extraordinary man.'

"Your last work you have distributed among the clergy of every denomination in this city, not only among the Reformed, but also among the Roman Catholics. You have also made it known in other towns, and in the universities of Holland. Almost a whole month has since elapsed, and I do not hear of a single person who is rising up against you. It seems, therefore, as if you were looking for adversaries; but to say it openly, I am afraid you will find none. For most people despise your memorable relations, which are indeed wonderful but not proved, and they ridicule them as the mere outbirth of your imagination. Others again are delighted with them, as with fairy tales, but nevertheless make sport of them. Still others from common report speak of you as a heretic; and others regard you as a madman. . . .

"Far be it from me to put a limit to the Divine Omnipotence. And I lay aside all my metaphysics and my psychology in order not to wrong a venerable old man of eighty years and upwards, not to injure a righteous, just, and most learned man, or detract from his merits. I am willing therefore to grant that it has pleased the Lord to

manifest Himself to you, and to send you to teach new things which have hitherto been concealed from the church and the whole race of mankind. Nay, I am willing to admit that it has been granted to you to be in the spiritual world with angels and at the same time in the natural world with men, and indeed for twenty-five years.

"Yet, my dear friend, why do you not convince the incredulous world of this your legitimate mission? It is your duty publicly to set forth, with all attendant circumstances which you can truthly adduce, your mission, which is such as has never since the time of the first man been entrusted to any man; and totally to remove from the minds of your readers all doubts that may occur to them. If you refuse to do so, you must not take it amiss, if in the whole world you do not find a single reader willing to believe you.

"It is stated that you verbally reported from the spiritual world a conversation, which the Queen of Sweden had at one time in the natural world with her brothers, the King and the Prince of Prussia, at Charlottenburg; and that the Queen, who knew that no one was secretly present who could have related the least word of it, was compelled to acknowledge that you became acquainted with the most minute circumstances of this conversation by the relation of her departed brother, and, indeed, exactly as it had taken place. It is well known that people are generally interested in new and wonderful things, and listen to them most eagerly. Several of my friends have related to me this occurrence. Yet each time I heard it, gossip has added some new and curious circumstances to your miracle. You yourself have told me, that this occurrence has actually taken place. Tell it then to the unbelieving world. You owe this to the cause of truth; for you have at least a Queen and the great King for your witnesses. Perhaps they will suffice.

"One eye-witness is worth more than ten who have heard a thing by report. You have both heard and seen things. Yet the world has the right to exact additional testimony to

your own, that you have actually seen and heard those things. . . .

"We have Moses and the prophets, and we have the adorable Author of Christianity. . . . If, therefore, a new ambassador wishes to teach something new about heaven or hell, let him take heed, that he advance not things which contradict the old truths, founded in such a sure word. It will be easy for me to prove that your writings are contradictory thereto. For instance, you accept two fundamental elements which are ever opposed to each another, both of which according to your doctrinal definitions seem to me equally eternal. This very same doctrine was formerly taught by Manes. The orthodox teachers will, therefore, undoubtedly regard you as a follower of Manicheism. Again, you deny the creation of angels and the fall of Lucifer, the author of pride and of sin. Concerning the fall of our first parents you keep silence altogether. You assert in your usual manner that in the whole heaven there is not a single angel who had been created from the beginning; and that in hell also there is no devil who had been created an angel of light, and had been cast down; but you declare that all in heaven, as well as in hell, originated from the human race. You deny the resurrection of the flesh, and the destruction or at least the dissolution of the world at the Last Judgment, which, according to things seen by you, was accomplished in the spiritual world in 1757, and in respect to the Dutch on January 9. . . .

"No one, I think, will deny that in the literal sense there is a spiritual sense; and I willingly admit that you are most versed in that spiritual sense; nay, I acknowledge it with admiration. Your little treatise on 'The White Horse' would please me above your other works, if towards the close you did not rashly deny the inspiration and Divine authority of the apostolic epistles of Paul, Peter, John, James, and Jude; because, in your opinion, they have no internal sense. Yet I pass over these things with many others.

"I will now say a few words about your conversation

with spirits, which no one will believe, or deem worthy of belief, so long as it rests on your own, and no other, testimony. Most reverend man, by my intercourse with you I have been convinced of your probity and your sincere love of the truth. Your idea of the incarnate Word, the Redeemer of mankind, who can never sufficiently be venerated and loved, has inspired me with the deepest reverence for you. But I will not enter more into details.

"Permit me, my dearest friend, to value this pledge of your love most highly, viz. that I may tell you freely and candidly what your haughty and envious readers are unwilling to tell you. Pardon me, if I do not acknowledge as sufficient your own testimony on the things you have 'heard and seen.' . . .

"But let me use your own words. You say in your work on 'Heaven and Hell,' no. 249: 'Persons who think much on religious subjects, and dwell upon them so incessantly as at length to see them inwardly, as it were, in themselves, also begin to hear spirits speaking to them: for religious subjects of whatever kind, when a man of his own accord, dwells upon them incessantly, and does not occasionally vary his meditations by attending to things which are of use in the world, penetrate to the interior, and there fix themselves, taking possession of the whole of man's spirit; when they enter into the spiritual world, and act upon the spirits who are there. These, however, are visionaries and enthusiasts, who believe any spirit whom they hear speaking to be the Holy Spirit, although he is only an enthusiastic spirit. Those spirits who are of this description see falsities as truths, and because they see them, they persuade themselves and also others with whom they communicate by influx. As these spirits also began to persuade men to evils, and led them to commit them, they were gradually removed. Enthusiastic spirits are distinguished from others by this peculiarity, that they believe themselves to be the Holy Spirit, and what they say to be Divine oracles. These spirits do not offer injury to a man, if he pays them Divine worship and

honor. I, also, have sometimes conversed with these spirits, and then their nefarious practices were discovered.'

"So excellently you judge of visionaries, enthusiasts, and fanatics of this sort. But where is that specific difference, which distinguishes you from them? I have never doubted your honesty and sincerity. But your spirits appear too suspicious to me, and the wisdom which you attribute to them sometimes verges into insanity, *e. g.* when they desire that you should assert from their mouth, that in the whole of heaven there is not a single angel who was created such in the beginning.

"I am afraid that such nefarious spirits sometimes were not sufficiently explored by you, and that they have imposed upon you. For 'Satan himself,' according to the weighty testimony of Paul (2 Cor. xi, 14) 'is transformed into an angel of light'.

"If I have succeeded in expressing to you my first doubts, and have pointed out to you where your system requires additional proofs, I am satisfied. You yourself can, if you choose, discover other reasons by which you may remove the remaining doubts in incredulous readers. You will please look upon this letter as a mere precursor. The remainder of what I have to say cannot be treated lightly and cursorily. Farewell.

[John Christian Cuno.]

"Amsterdam, March 8, 1769."

"Just as my letter is written here, I sent it to him sealed, and waited a few days to see whether he would answer me. As he did not do so, I went to see him. I found him quite cold; nay, to say the truth, he appeared to me even a little angry. Nothing seemed to surprise him more than that I had suspected his honest angels, and regarded him as simple enough to be their dupe. He told me dryly, 'If you are not willing to believe me, you have expended far too much trouble in studying my writings so attentively as you have.' When he said these words it seemed to me, as if the smiling and innocent expression, which I was accustomed to see in

his face, had totally vanished. . . . The anger which he seemed to entertain against me did not last very long; and he soon became reconciled again. A short time afterwards he came to me, and put the adjoined paper * into my hand. It is indeed, not an answer to my letter, but at all events it is an autograph of one of the most singular men that have ever lived, and on account of its strange contents also is worthy of preservation. . . .

"Dear reader, in all that precedes methinks I have given you some information deserving to be known. Judge of it yourself: for to tell you the truth, I do not know at the present moment what I ought to think of him. I am quite willing to grant that the honest man is in his second childhood; but I still believe that whoever desires to make out that he is insane, commits a sin against him. Let him give an account of his errors before God. I am not willing to judge him, so that I may not be judged. My intention in writing to him was sincere, both in respect to him and in respect to others who knew him, or who, impelled by sheer curiosity, may become acquainted with him, in order to see something rare or extraordinary. I therefore, cannot feel any regret for having written against him, or for having allowed others to make copies of my letter. As for the rest, time must teach what will be the fate of his manifold writings in the world. I remember here the words of Gamaliel, in Acts v, 38, 39, 'If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought. But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it.' Far be it from me to pronounce a final opinion as to how much there is here of God, and how much of man; this I leave for those to decide who are professional theologians. Every Christian who cares for the salvation and for the truth is enjoined 'to try the spirits whether they are of God' (1 John iv, 1), and I follow the advice given in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians (v, 19-21), 'Quench not

* A copy of the concluding paragraph (n. 20) of Swedenborg's "Intercourse between the Soul and the Body."

the spirit; despise not prophesyings; but prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.'

"No one will be able to deny that Swedenborg is a philosopher, and indeed one of the first magnitude; and if no other proof existed of this than the three volumes in folio quoted above: *Principia rerum naturalium sive novorum tentaminum phaenomena mundi elementaris philosophice explicandi. Cum figuris aeneis.* In the whole history of the world therefore I have found no other scholar with whom I could compare him except the great physician and chemist Theophrastus Paracelsus. I have perused Swedenborg's philosophical works somewhat, and do not wish to enter here upon the discussion of them, in order not to become too diffuse. I will leave his philosophy where I found it; only, neither in his philosophy must he offend against the Sacred Scripture. He concludes his first part with the following words of the great philosopher Wolf, 'Full liberty must be granted to all who philosophize in a philosophical manner, nor have we any reason to apprehend from such a liberty any danger either to religion, to virtue, or to the state.'

"I accept this sentiment of the late Christopher von Wolf without hesitation; yet I should like to submit this point for consideration, whether it is not a great offence that the description of the creation should be quite different with the philosophers from what it is in Moses. . . . What Swedenborg in his chapter xii says about the earthly paradise and the first man, methinks is out of place in a work on philosophy, just as much as where he supports this saying of Wolf, that no danger accrues thence to religion.

"What I desire to state here, however, is that Mr. Swedenborg as a philosopher is quite modest and unassuming, but as a theologian more than arrogant. Suffice it to say that his language as a theologian sounds thus: As a divine I have received a calling immediately from the Lord; I have been sent from heaven in order to disabuse the whole world of its prejudices, and to discover arcana which no man has

ever before known. This is the reason why I am writing so many books; but if any one does not choose to believe the testimony I bear concerning myself, he must not read my books. How modestly, on the other hand, he writes as a philosopher (p. 451, Latin edition), 'Should any one undertake to impugn my sentiments, I have no wish to oppose him; but in case he desire it, I shall be happy to explain my principles and reasons more at large. What need however is there of words? Let the thing speak for itself. If what I have said be true, why should I be eager to defend it?—surely truth can defend itself. If what I have said be false, it would be a degrading and silly task to defend it. Why therefore should I make myself an enemy to any one, or place myself in opposition to him.'

"While writing the above, a little work was brought to my notice which had been printed at Konigsberg in 1766, thus three years ago, bearing the following title: 'Dreams of a spirit-seer explained by dreams of metaphysics'. The author [Immanuel Kant] does not give his name. He uses a fiery and satirical pen. Mr. Swedenborg is his spirit-seer, and he seeks to make him ridiculous; and yet he has no proper knowledge of him, and constantly calls him 'Schwedenborg'; perhaps because he has hitherto published his works anonymously, and has put his name only before his recent works, published last year and during the present one; yet his name and official character are given in full in his philosophical and mineralogical works printed in 1734; besides, his name is sufficiently well-known in the learned world, so that to be ignorant of it is not particularly flattering to a critic of philosophy and metaphysics. You may read, however, two-thirds of the work before you find Swedenborg's name mentioned, and meanwhile the author makes sport of metaphysics and the learned generally. His style is lively and readable. . . .

"I will leave the old gentleman Swedenborg alone. God knows him better than I do. I must consider him a scholar and a learned man; but is it a proof of true humility for

him to say of the Evangelical Christians, 'They place the understanding under obedience to faith, and call that faith which is not understood'? . . .

"Last year (1769) I gave my readers many sheets to read respecting my dear old Swedenborg; but I am by no means done yet with this singular man, and as long as my eyes remain open, I shall not so easily turn them away from him.

"I still hear news concerning him from Sweden, nay, a short time ago he desired to be remembered to me, and sent me word that he hoped to embrace me this summer. The clergy have made an assault upon him with all their power, but they could not do him any harm, because those high in authority, yea, it is said, the King and the Queen, love him. . . .

"Time alone will show what will in the end become of this good man. When I saw him on Sepetmber 10th this year (1770) on change with his friend, Mr. Wretman, he looked much more cheerful than when he took leave of me last year."

Cuno's Letter to a Friend in Hamburg (Jan. 26, 1771).

"You ask me what this old man is now doing. I will tell you. He eats and drinks very moderately, but sleeps pretty long; thirteen hours are not too much for him. When I informed him that his work, 'The Earths in the Universe', had appeared in a (German) translation, his eyes, always smiling, became twice as bright. He is now indefatigably at work; yea, I must say that he labors in a most astonishing and superhuman manner at his new work. . . . I will also tell you the title of the work he has in hand: it is as follows: 'True Christian Religion, containing the Universal Theology of the New Church, predicted by the Lord in Daniel viii, 1, 3, 14, and in the Apocalypse xxii, 1, 2', by Emanuel Swedenborg, servant of the Lord Jesus Christ. I could not, in my open manner, conceal my astonishment that he should declare himself on the title-page the servant of the Lord Jesus Christ. But he replied, 'I have asked, and have re-

ceived not only permission, but also an express command'. You can scarcely believe with what confidence the old gentleman speaks of his spiritual world, his angels, and of God Himself. If I were to give you only a summary of our last conversation, I should fill many pages. He spoke of naturalists [who ascribe all things to nature], with whom he conversed recently after their death; most of these had even been theologians, or such as during their life in the body had made theology their profession. Things were then said which caused my ears to ring, but which I pass over, in order not to be too precipitous in my judgment. I am quite willing to confess that I do not know what to make of him. He remains to me a riddle which I cannot solve. . . .

"I wish very much that upright men, whom God has placed as watchmen upon the walls of Zion, had occupied themselves with this man some time ago. I have read his writings, and proved them impartially; but in my opinion dogmas are taught there which deserve to be examined more thoroughly by upright theologians; and there are others which ought to have been refuted at the very beginning."

Cuno's Letter to a Merchant in Hamburg (March 5, 1771).

"I cannot forbear to tell you something quite new about Swedenborg. Last Thursday I paid him a visit, and as usual found him writing. He told me that same morning he had been in conversation with the late King of Sweden for three hours in the spiritual world. . . .

"In order to lessen my astonishment, he added that Dr. Ernesti of Leipzig had appeared to him in a similar manner in the spiritual world, and that he had had a regular disputation with him. I wonder what this learned professor will say when he hears of this. Perhaps 'The old gentleman is crazy, and in his second childhood'. He will laugh at it, and who can blame him for it? It is inconceivable to me how I myself can refrain from laughing, when I hear such extraordinary things of him. And what is more; I have

often heard him relate similar things in large parties consisting of ladies and gentlemen, among whom I knew very well were persons given to mockery; but to my great astonishment no one thought of laughing. As long as he speaks, it is as if every person who hears him was charmed, and compelled to believe him. He is reserved to no one. Whoever invites him, is sure to have him. Last week a certain young gentleman invited him to his house; and although he was not acquainted with him, he appeared at his table, where he met with Jews and Portuguese, and conversed with them freely without distinction. If any one is curious to see him, he has no great difficulty; all that is necessary for him to do is to go to his house, where he admits every one. It can easily be seen, that the numerous calls which he thus receives draw largely upon his time; and so much the less can I understand how he nevertheless accomplishes his design, of having printed every week two closely set up sheets, and to compose ten sheets of manuscript, without having a single line in reserve. He says, that his angel dictates to him, and that he can write fast enough. I have no more space to tell you more about him."

The preceding pages show that Cuno was very much disturbed by Swedenborg's supernatural claims, and was anxiously insistent that he should prove them. The kind of proof he demanded is shown by his reference to "the Queen's story". His idea evidently was, that a few well authenticated cases of the kind would be sufficient proof. But Swedenborg rested his case on entirely different evidence; namely, the evidence of truth itself as seen in its own light,—in other words, the principle of consistency. Cuno himself, whose personal experience with Swedenborg on this point was more direct, familiar, and complete than that of any one else, remained in doubt to the end; and his loud calls for proof seemed to be directed more to the disbelievers in society generally than to his own satisfaction. It is to Cuno's credit, that he stoutly and confidently maintains that Swedenborg was perfectly sound in mind and

body; and this in spite of the frequency with which the epithet "madman" was lightly banded about by scoffers and those who were not scoffers. But naturally and inevitably the recital of opinions on this point is a long story; and the end is not yet.

Another point on which Cuno was greatly disturbed was, some of Swedenborg's doctrines. He recognized and appreciated Swedenborg's modesty as a man and as a philosopher, but he was strongly impressed with the idea that he was "as a theologian more than arrogant". It is important to note, however, that the arrogance was imputed because of the claim to "have received a calling immediately from the Lord". Even so, Cuno was nevertheless in real grave doubt whether he should admit or reject this claim; and he had the same doubt about the claim to converse with spirits. The fact of making these two claims, and this fact alone, naturally and inevitably subjected Swedenborg to the suspicion of being mentally unbalanced; and the natural inference from this fact has been the presupposition of all attempts to maintain that he was insane. This, however, in the face of all the evidence to the contrary, is merely begging the question. As to the question of arrogance, Swedenborg's attitude towards his theological writings was exactly the same as towards his scientific and philosophical writings; in both cases all he asked was that his writings be read with serious purpose and with fair-minded intelligence. He disclaimed on principle any authority except that of the truth itself rationally apprehended. This is what Cuno failed to recognize and appreciate. He demanded non-rational and supra-rational proofs; such, for example, as "the Queen's story" furnished. But Swedenborg deliberately and consistently refused to attach any importance to such instances, even though they were fully authenticated; he rested his case solely on the inherent truthfulness of his message. In other words, he left it to the arbitrament of experience, to reason and intelligence.

In his lively protest against Swedenborg's teaching of

what seemed to him false doctrines, Cuno likewise failed to grasp the real issue. He admitted in general the principle that the Bible has a spiritual sense, and he acknowledged with unfeigned admiration that Swedenborg was extraordinarily versed in that sense; but he objected strenuously to some of the particulars of Swedenborg's interpretation, and to certain of his religious doctrines. He essayed to prove that these were contradictory to the "sure Word". He instances the doctrine that all angels were once men, born here on the earth, or on some other earth; also the doctrine that there is no resurrection of the body of flesh; and finally the doctrine that the world will not be destroyed at the time of the Last Judgment. There is less disposition to call in question Swedenborg's position on these points nowadays than in the middle of the eighteenth century. As a matter of fact, modern theology is much nearer to Swedenborg than to mediaeval orthodoxy.

With Cuno the recital of the impressions and opinions of Swedenborg's acquaintances is fairly complete. There are other prominent men who might be cited to the same effect; but they are less important, because they deal only with special points. Among such the following names may be mentioned: 1. Baron Daniel Tilas, Swedenborg's successor in the college of mines (see Tilas' letter to his colleague, Axel Frederic Cronstedt, March 24, 1760, in Tafel's Documents, Vol. II, Doc. 249, p. 397). 2. Count Carl Gustav Tessin, who filled many important positions of State, among them President of the House of Nobles, and Minister to Paris. His account of Swedenborg is contained in his diary, published 1819 (see Tafel's Documents, Vol. II, Doc. 250, p. 398). The accounts of Tilas and Tessin concern directly Swedenborg's intercourse with spirits, and they are especially interesting as regarding the first public knowledge of Swedenborg's other-world experience. 3. Christopher Springer, an important agent in Swedish international politics, especially in the courts of Great Britain and Russia. Springer's testimony is given in his letter to Abbé Pernéty,

written at the latter's request, Jan. 18, 1782, from London (see Tafel's Documents, Vol. II, Document 261, pp. 528-533). 4. The Rev. Nicholas Collin (see Tafel's Documents, Vol. II, Doc. 253, pp. 417-424; also *New Church Life,* Jan. 1914). His testimony was published originally in the form of a communication which appeared simultaneously in the *Philadelphia Gazette,* and in the *American Daily Advertiser,* for August 5th, 8th, 12th, and 15th, 1801.

Lewis F. Hite.

THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAMBRIDGE SOCIETY OF THE NEW JERUSALEM*

By Charles H. Taft, D.M.D.

VERY deeply do I appreciate the compliment paid me in being asked to present on this happy occasion a brief sketch of the inception, the growth, and happenings of the Cambridge New-Church Society during the first twenty-five years of its existence. Never before has it been either my privilege or my pleasure to enact the roll of historian. But there has been, I assure you, ample opportunity in the preparation of this address to learn what it means to become a very imperfect one. Much that should be incorporated in a paper of this kind has had to be eliminated entirely or covered in a very general way. But it has been my endeavor to present in chronological order, so far as possible, some of the outstanding events that have helped to make history for our Society since its birth as a mission of the Boston Society of the New Jerusalem in 1888, and others that occurred at an even earlier date in 1883, not directly connected with the history of our Society, yet perhaps equally interesting.

The earliest organized effort of record that was ever made in a public way to bring before the people of Cambridge the subject of Emanuel Swedenborg and his teachings, occurred on Sunday evening, November 11, 1883, when, with gracious hospitality, the First Church (Unitarian) opened its doors for the delivery of a series of four lectures under the auspices of the Swedenborg Lecture Bureau, the first by Mr. George Makepeace Towle, a promi-

*An address before members and friends of the Cambridge Society on the evening of November 12, 1926.

nent layman and popular lecturer on eminent men of the world. His subject was "Swedenborg as a Man and as a Philosopher." Mr. Towle's reputation as a lecturer served to bring out on that evening a large and attentive audience. This Lecture Bureau was composed of a group of earnest men, among whom were Mr. Clarence W. Barron, the late Rev. John Worcester, and the late Messrs. Edmund D. Barbour, Arthur Burnham, and James R. Carter, men who felt that public thought had taken such form and had reached such a receptive state as made the time ripe for spreading in an effective manner the teachings of Emanuel Swedenborg.

Among the missionary efforts of that Bureau were the giving of public lectures and the distribution of many thousands of copies of Swedenborg's "Heaven and Hell." A part of one edition was sent to school teachers, with the request that each recipient's views or opinion of the book be sent to the Bureau after it had been more or less carefully perused. The only response that came from this request for many years was a single copy that came back in ashes, expressive of one school teacher's reception of the book.

It may be of interest to mention in this connection that there was in the audience on the evening of Mr. Towle's lecture one of the then Cambridge school teachers, Miss Mary P. Blair, an attentive listener to all that was said, who later united with the Boston Society of the New Jerusalem, became an active member of it, and was, in 1901, one of the charter members of the Cambridge Society.

The second, third, and fourth lectures were given in the same place on successive Sunday evenings by the Rev. James Reed of Boston, and were reported in full in the local press. These lectures antedated by five years the first New-Church services that were held in Cambridge, and culminated in the ultimate institution of an independent society, whose twenty-fifth anniversary we are today joyously celebrating.

So vividly do I remember those lectures given forty-three

years ago, and so interesting were the remarks by Mr. Reed at the close of his last lecture on the subject of "The Lord Jesus Christ; or, God in His Divine Humanity the True Object of Worship," that I may be allowed to quote them.

> In closing this brief course of lectures, I am well aware how inadequate is the presentation they have given of the doctrinal system contained in the writings of Swedenborg. But I trust I have not altogether failed to suggest thoughts which some of you will value, and which will stimulate further inquiry. Believe me, the march of progress which changes all things else will make no exception of religious knowledge and belief. The hand of improvement will not be withheld from Christianity itself. Higher developments are yet to be attained in spiritual faith and life than any which past ages have known. Happy they whose minds are open to receive the truth by whatever way it comes.

Nothing of a definite nature looking to the holding of services in Cambridge was done until the fall of 1888 when the Rev. James Reed presented to the Boston Society at one of its quarterly business meetings a very thoughtful and timely address upon the subject of "Church Extension in the Suburbs." He pointed out the constantly diminishing attendance at worship with the reasons therefor, and strongly advocated the holding of services in out-of-town places where there were a sufficient number of New-Church people to form a nucleus of what it was confidently expected would, later on, become a new and independent society of the New Church.

Mr. Reed's address met with the instant and cordial approval of the Boston Society. A committee consisting of Messrs. Charles R. Shaw, Charles H. Taft, Thaddeus W. Harris, and Clarence H. Blake was appointed to canvass the New-Church residents of Cambridge to learn their views upon the subject, and to find out to what extent they would support it. The canvass showed that there were just one hundred persons in Cambridge who were more or less interested in this movement, the large majority being in hearty sympathy with it.

The next thing in order was the selection of a suitable

place for holding the meetings. After due consideration, Roberts Hall, at 15 Brattle Square, was the place chosen as having the greatest number of advantages. Four o'clock in the afternoon was set as the hour that would best accommodate all who were likely to attend. It was decided that services should begin on Sunday, December 2, 1888, the first Sunday of the month. The weather on that day was particularly favorable for a good attendance, which numbered 88. The Rev. James Reed preached a fine sermon, and several from the choir of the Boston Society added much to the musical part of the services.

With an interest in the growth of the Cambridge movement no less keen than that of its originator, the late Rev. John Worcester had long hoped that the Theological School might some day be located in Cambridge, and felt that these services seemed to be a forerunner of that event. He visualized the benefits that would come to both the School and a church society whenever a suitable location could be found.

On the Standing Committee of the Cambridge Congregation there was another man of vision, Mr. Thaddeus W. Harris, an Instructor in Harvard University, who was then living in Divinity Hall, and who one day, in passing by what was known as the Sparks Estate, at the corner of Quincy and Kirkland Streets, suddenly thought what a wonderful place it would be for both the Theological School and a church society, provided the necessary funds could be raised with which to purchase it. He suggested the idea to his father and to Mr. David L. Webster, President of the Corporation, both of whom were quick to see the advantages it had to offer, besides a sure increase in valuation from year to year on account of the location, and close proximity to Harvard College. No time was lost in effecting a purchase of the property, consisting of a large dwelling house and sixty thousand square feet of land, for the sum of thirty-five thousand dollars. This was early in 1889.

On March 27, 1889, an important business meeting of the Congregation was held in the Sparks building. A full

report of that meeting is contained in a handsomely bound book, inscribed as follows:

The Beginnings of New-Church Services in Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1888-1889, leading to the institution of the Cambridge Society of the New Jerusalem on Sunday, May 5, 1901. From the records and notes kept by Clarence H. Blake, secretary of the first New-Church Committee, appointed October 15, 1888, by the Church Committee of the Boston Society of the New Jerusalem. Compiled by Lloyd A. Frost, clerk of the Cambridge Society of the New Jerusalem.

It is to be hoped that every member will, in some leisure hour, peruse this memorial to Mr. Blake, given to the Cambridge Society by our dear friend, Helen M. Blake.

Naturally, the next thing in order was the erection of a chapel which should be adapted to the needs of both School and Congregation; and until this had been accomplished, the society was invited by the Board of Directors of the Theological School to make free use of the Sparks building for purposes of worship only. This invitation was cordially accepted.

In the meantime the Rev. Theodore F. Wright, pastor of the Bridgewater Society, accepted a call to become resident professor at the School, his work to commence in September 1889. He was invited, too, by a unanimous vote of the Cambridge Congregation, to become its minister until a permanent society should be established. The call was accepted, and he began his work with us in September of that year; and the first morning service of the Cambridge Congregation in the chapel of the School building was held on Sunday, September 29, 1889.

The first annual report of the Cambridge Congregation as a mission of the Boston Society was made to the Massachusetts Association in April 1896, and was continued each year thereafter. From the 1898 report we find that, while the Congregation was not on a sound financial basis, no pecuniary assistance had been required from the Boston Society for the past three years. In 1899 the Cambridge Congregation had completed eleven years of mission work

in the city of Cambridge. It had grown in numbers from a little band of twelve or fifteen people to a congregation of ninety, with a Sunday school of forty-three children and two adult classes of about thirty. It had raised and presented to the Board of Managers of the Theological School the sum of seven thousand dollars towards the cost of a chapel and furnishings.

At this point in the history of the Society we have to record the passing of Mr. Blake to the higher life on February 17, 1900. Coming into the New Church as a young man, he joined the Boston Society and became very quickly one of its most energetic and useful members. As one of the Committee of Five to arrange for the institution of services in Cambridge, he did effective work, and took a lively interest in the construction of the chapel as it progressed from week to week. The steadily increasing growth in numbers of the Congregation was, in large measure, due to his affectionate interest in the Church and its welfare, and to his earnest efforts to spread a knowledge of the New Church whenever he saw an opportunity. The Church has not so large a number of men like Clarence Blake that it can afford to lose one without placing upon its records a sense of its great loss.

The time having now come for the formation of an independent society, a circular letter was drawn up by Dr. Wright and sent to every one connected with the Congregation, asking for their opinions on the subject, and requesting those who so wished to state their purpose of joining such a society when formed. Seventy-two persons signed the paper of declaration, becoming Charter Members of the Society. Who these members were may be found by consulting the "blue book," presented to the Society by Mr. Charles Harris, and kept in the care of the clerk. The Rev. James Reed was invited to institute the Society under the name of the Cambridge Society of the New Jerusalem. This occurred on Sunday, May 5, 1901, in connection with the usual services on that day. Mr. Reed read the declara-

tion of intentions, and as each name was called, that person arose; and all were then declared to be the Cambridge Society of the New Jerusalem. At the close of this impressive service the sacrament of the Holy Supper was administered.

Finally, came the day looked forward to by every one when the chapel was completed and made ready for occupancy. In view of the close relationship which had existed, and which it was felt should continue to exist, between the School and the Congregation, the latter was invited to occupy the chapel for religious services until otherwise ordered. On Sunday, November 10, 1901, the first service of worship in the new building was conducted by the Rev. Dr. T. F. Wright.

To the great satisfaction of all who had contributed of their means to the building of the chapel or to its necessary furnishings, it was formally dedicated on Sunday, December 1, 1901. Designed in the pure English Gothic style by the late Herbert Langford Warren, Professor of Architecture in Harvard University, the building adds greatly to the value of the property of which it has become a part. Whether viewed from within or without, the effect is very pleasing and satisfying.

Ever on the alert to suggest to others or to do himself anything he believed to be for the welfare of the Theological School and the Cambridge Society, Dr. Wright early foresaw what an advantage it would be for the School to acquire a part of the estate on the east side of the Sparks building, which had been removed from its original site to its present location. This proposition did not meet with the immediate approval of the Board of Managers; but a little later, with the help of a very generous donation from Dr. Wright, the purchase was effected. The wisdom of this act has been seen again and again during the past quarter century.

Too close an application to the new duties assumed by Dr. Wright after coming to Cambridge resulted in a threatened nervous breakdown; and to his request for a

year's leave of absence, the Society gave immediate assent.

Previous to the advent of the Cambridge Congregation as an independent society, it had received material help from the Boston Society and from friends outside the organization. With estimated expenses for the year 1904 of $1,500, and receipts of $1,100, it became necessary for the treasurer to send out a call, urging an increase in the offering of every member and attendant at church services.

A request from the local G. A. R. Post 56 that they might hold their usual Memorial Day Service in our chapel brought forth a cordial assent from the Theological School. It occurred on May 29, 1904. As chaplain of Post 56, the sermon was preached by our own minister, Dr. Wright. Owing to a second breakdown in physical health, Dr. Wright was again forced to ask for a leave of absence from October 26, 1907, to the beginning of the next church year, that he and Mrs. Wright might visit the Holy Land. But ere the objective point was reached, a cablegram was received announcing his sudden death at sea. The unexpectedness of the event cast a shadow upon all who knew him, both within and without the Church. A fitting memorial service was held in the chapel on Wednesday afternoon, December 4, 1907. The chapel was filled to its capacity by friends who had gathered to pay their tributes of love and esteem for one whose life had been consecrated to deeds of useful service in so many public and private ways. A sturdy champion of the No License cause in Cambridge, as well as in other out-of-town cities, he labored long and earnestly in driving the saloons out of Cambridge, and in keeping them out year after year. As President of the East End Christian Union for several years, he showed a tender solicitude for all who were afflicted in mind, body or estate, and a great desire to render such assistance as came within his power to give. An accomplished scholar and theologian, a moral and social reformer, a ready and fluent speaker at all times—whether in the pulpit or on the public platform—he was, by nature as well as by inheritance

from his father and mother, a man of lofty ideals, who knew no other way than that of living up to them. As the Rev. Woodman Bradbury, former pastor of the Old Cambridge Baptist Church, said in an appreciative estimate of his friend:

> Recalling to mind the tribute of Lowell to Channing, to whom more fittingly than to Dr. Wright could these words apply?
>
> "Thou art not idle: in thy higher sphere
> Thy spirit bends itself to loving tasks;
> And strength to perfect what it dreamed of here,
> Is all the crown and glory that it asks."

On Easter Sunday, 1904, there was used for the first time the silver tankard of the communion service, a gift to the Society from Miss Cornelia Horsford, daughter of the late Prof. Eben Horsford, in memory of Ellen McManus, who was a member of the Boston Society and who died in 1893, having been for many years an honored and respected domestic in the Horsford family. This service remained in use until the individual cups and trays were adopted.

In the interval of three years between the decease of Dr. Wright and the coming to Cambridge of the Rev. William L. Worcester, the pulpit was occupied for the first year or two on alternate Sundays by the Rev. George S. Wheeler and the Rev. Russell Eaton; and later by the Rev. Messrs. D. V. Bowen and J. E. Werren.

To cherish the spirit of good fellowship which the breaking of bread together always engenders, the Society quite early in its history began holding in the parlors of the Sparks building a series of social church suppers during the spring, fall and winter months, to which friends from other societies are always cordially invited. Some form of wholesome entertainment usually follows the supper from eight until ten o'clock.

On May 5, 1909, Mr. Charles Harris, chairman of the Church Committee for eight years, was called to the higher life. A member of the Boston Society for many years and a constant attendant upon its services, he, too, saw the

necessity for Church extension in the suburbs way back in 1883, and entered into the organization and institution of an independent society with great energy and enthusiasm. What Mr. Harris was to the Cambridge Society is well expressed in a memorial prepared by Mr. John C. Moses and the Rev. J. E. Werren, and spread upon the records of the Society. Mr. C. Henry St. John was chosen to succeed Mr. Harris as chairman of the Church Committee.

There now began a new chapter in the Society's history. In a letter sent to all members and friends on January 24, 1911, announcement was made that the Rev. William L. Worcester, in response to a unanimous call of the Society on May 25, 1910, would begin his work as minister on Sunday, February 5, 1911, and bespeaking the co-operation of all members and friends of the Society in making it a record of progress and success. On February 15, a reception was given to Mr. and Mrs. Worcester, shortly after taking up their residence in Cambridge. The occasion was a very delightful one for all who were present, including the Directors and Board of Managers of the Theological School. To have the Worcester family as a permanency meant much to us all. The issuing of a monthly manual was now begun, and has been regularly continued up to the present time.

At this point, seventeen months later in the Society's history, we have again to record an event that touched the heart of every member of the Society, when Ethel Burnham Worcester, wife of our beloved pastor, was, on November 18, 1912, suddenly removed from among us in all her radiant young womanhood. In the short time that she had been with us, she had endeared herself to young and old alike. Mr. St. John was directed to convey to Mr. Worcester the profound sympathy of every member of the Society in his great loss, and giving him a four weeks' leave of absence from all ministerial duties. Mr. John Moses was requested to represent the Society at the funeral services held in Philadelphia.

Representing the Cambridge Society on January 23, 1913, Mr. Worcester and Mr. St. John were in attendance, by invitation, at the installation services in the First Church (Congregational) of the Rev. Dr. Raymond Calkins, one of our well-known Cambridge ministers, who is ever taking an energetic part in all things pertaining to the welfare of Church and City. Notably among such activities was an organized movement for the development of neighborhood co-operation among the seven Old Cambridge Protestant Churches in matters of common interest and duty, especially that of looking after the non-church-going population, the relation of the church to public charities, etc. What is known as the "Committee of Twenty-one," composed of the pastor and two laymen from each of these churches, has been, for the past thirteen years, engaged in finding opportunities for useful service in many ways. It holds regular monthly meetings, and our own Church has done its full part in working harmoniously with the other churches for the accomplishment of the common good.

A little incident showing the friendly attitude and relationship existing between our own and other churches in Old Cambridge was a request from the Rev. Dr. Crothers of the Unitarian Church to bring over to our Theological School certain classes in his Sunday school to inspect and study the model of the Tabernacle. This request was, of course, cordially granted.

One of the really worth while activities in which the Theological School and the Society have a mutual interest is what is known as the Lynn Neighborhood House. The proceeds of an occasional entertainment on the grounds of the School help to maintain the very important work we are trying to do for the material and spiritual uplift of the young people in that neighboring city.

An illustration of the close relation that has existed without a break between School and Society is given every year at the graduating exercises in June, which are followed by

an informal reception on the grounds under the direct charge of the ladies of the Church.

The first Union Service of the Old Cambridge Sunday Schools, including our own, was held in the First Church (Congregational) on Sunday afternoon, October 14, 1917, a service that has been continued each year to the present time. In union there is often the power to accomplish more for what the Churches and Sunday Schools are trying to do than what can be done by them individually. This particular service having once begun, let us hope will be permanently continued.

The League Reading Circle is one of the Society's activities that interests more especially the younger generation. Meetings in which all can feel free to take an active part are held weekly or bi-monthly at the home of Mr. and Miss Worcester. In addition to a careful study of some leading doctrine of the Church, its members, including the theological students, provide one or more social entertainments, the proceeds of which are expended in helping some worthy cause or institution, and for sending one of its members as a delegate to the meetings of the General Convention.

Another of the pleasant social occasions every year has been an informal reception to the incoming students of the Theological School at the home of Mr. and Miss Worcester. The students, many of whom come from the far ends of the earth, are given in this way an opportunity of becoming better acquainted with each other and with the church members as well. These occasions are very delightful ones, containing as they always do the expression of an unfailing hospitality on the part of host and hostess.

A Christmas Eve Service, intended primarily for the children, participated in by delegations from the Baptist, Congregational, Methodist-Episcopal, and Unitarian Sunday schools, was instituted on December 24, 1913, and has been continued every year. An interesting feature of the service is, of course, the lantern pictures, illustrative of scenes and

Bible stories throughout the life of our Lord. The carols, too, always add much to the enjoyment of this annual service in the chapel.

Passing over many things and events of interest that for want of time cannot be mentioned in this address, we come to the years of the great war and the part that the young men of the Church had in it. A service flag was placed in the chapel on Sunday, April 8, 1918, and the seventeen stars thereon represented the following members of the congregation who served in the Army, Navy, or Y. M. C. A. I will call them by name, "lest we forget": Parker G. Blake, Allan W. Clark, Chester T. Cook, Horatio W. Dresser, John Fisk Ford, Ira C. Frost, Hugh M. Hite, James Knowles, Jr., Pierce H. Leavitt, William C. Morgan, John M. Murray, Robert S. Porter, Henry F. Reynolds, John A. Selee, John W. Spiers, Henry D. Wyeth, and our one gold star member, Henry C. Shaw.

During the years of the great war there was established a radio school at Harvard College. At the same time, the National Lutheran Commission made arrangements for a reading room with a minister in charge for the purpose of providing a social home for the many men of that denomination who were attending the school. In response to an expressed desire on their part for a church building where they could worship together each week, it was our fortunate privilege to offer them the use of our chapel for either Sunday morning or afternoon services. These services covered a period of about eight months. We were happy to do this for our Lutheran friends as a contribution to the welfare work of the community during the war. They were very grateful for the use of the chapel, and were careful to leave everything in good order.

For the purpose of giving the young men of the Church an opportunity to serve on the Church Committee, the Society adopted the following rule at its annual meeting in 1918:

There shall be a Church Committee, nine in number, consisting of the minister, clerk and treasurer, and six other members of the

Society. The Committee shall choose its own chairman. At the annual meeting to be held in 1919, two members shall be chosen to serve for one year, two members for two years and two members for three years. Thereafter at each annual meeting two members shall be chosen for three years. No member shall be eligible for immediate re-election.

This plan has worked out very satisfactorily since the rule was adopted.

A piece of missionary work worthy of mention which we have been able to accomplish, is the moral and financial assistance given to the colored people in North Cambridge who have organized as a Community Church, under the ministerial leadership of Rev. S. O. Weems, a graduate of our Theological School, and a member in good standing on the role of qualified ministers. Mr. Weems has labored long and earnestly in his efforts to establish a church in that section of the city. He has won the hearty sympathy, respect and financial assistance of the Seven Churches in Old Cambridge by his sincerity of purpose in what he has done and hopes still further to do. A piece of land has been bought and paid for, and the energies of himself and his congregation are now centered, as ours once were, upon the erection of a church edifice which will be adapted to their every need.

Owing to the infirmities of advancing age, the Rev. James Reed felt obliged to give up the work pertaining to the general pastorate of the Massachusetts Association; and in compliance with his wishes in the matter, the Rev. William L. Worcester was chosen on April 19, 1919, to succeed him in that office.

The death of Charles R. Shaw, December 26, 1920, removed from among us the third member of the original five appointed to serve as the Standing Committee of the Cambridge Congregation when it was but a mission of the Boston Society in 1888. His passing left a great vacancy in our church life; and yet we know that he is still with us in spirit, and helping on the other side to strengthen us in both faith and deeds.

Our church manual for the month of May, 1921, records the death of our much loved friend, Pamelia K. Wright, widow of Dr. Wright, and a charter member of the Society. It was largely due to Mrs. Wright's initiative that the women's two auxiliary bodies came into existence. The Ladies' Aid and the Half-hour Club have been most helpful in the upbuilding of the Society, and instrumental in strengthening its usefulness and general influence in the community. Too much cannot be said in praise of the efficiency with which these active groups of our women members have worked all through the years.

The death of both the Rev. Ildefonso Agulo and our missionary to the Philippines, the Rev. G. Gordon Pulsford, left the Church in those islands without pastoral care; and agreeably to the request of the Board of Missions, Mr. Worcester, accompanied by his daughter Margaret, sailed from Vancouver on August 9, 1923, for the purpose of helping to reorganize the Church in Manila, and to provide such financial aid as was needed. Mr. Worcester also expected to visit the Rev. Mr. Watanabe in Japan, with a view of determining what could be done for the mission in Tokio. But ere this purpose could be consummated, a terrible earthquake fell upon the city, wiping out a great part of it, leaving Mr. Watanabe and his faithful followers in dire need of help. The General Convention, through its Board of Missions, promptly responded to this call with a cable of $1,000, and a message of deep sympathy for our New-Church friends in that far-off country. Our own Society took great pleasure in helping to raise this money, and in so doing to strengthen the ties of friendship between the New-Church people of both countries.

A candle-light tea party in the parlors of the School building, with appropriate decorations and quite an oriental atmosphere, was an occasion worthy of mention, when Mr. Worcester gave an illustrated lecture on his visit to the Philippines and Japan. In response to invitations from several New-Church societies, the lecture was given in

Boston, Brockton, Elmwood, Abington, Providence, Fall River, Brookline, and Philadelphia.

The inauguration of Ada Louise Comstock as the third president of Radcliffe College afforded the Theological School and the Cambridge Society much pleasure in giving to the College the use of our chapel on that day for the reception of invited guests from other colleges; and from the chapel the procession was formed for Sanders Theatre.

On April 21, 1925, the oldest member of our Society—though not a charter member—passed away in his ninety-fifth year, Mr. Charles Henry St. John. Mr. St. John was for many years an editor of the *Youth's Companion*, a former member of the Roxbury Society, and for ten years chairman of our Church Committee. We shall always think of him as a gentleman of the old school, a genial companion, and a staunch New-Churchman.

An event of quite recent interest to every member of the Society was the marriage of Miss Margaret Worcester, eldest daughter of our pastor, and the Rev. Horace Briggs, on Thursday evening, September 9, 1926, when our little chapel, beautifully adorned, was filled to its capacity on that auspicious occasion. The marriage ceremony was performed by the bride's father; and a very beautiful feature of it was the singing of Hymn 445 in the "Magnificat" by Miss Elizabeth Worcester in the chancel, while the bride and groom were kneeling at the altar. The words of that hymn were written by Mr. Worcester, and sung at his own wedding in Philadelphia, January 1, 1900. There followed at the bride's home, immediately after the ceremony, a reception, at which many friends and guests extended to the young couple affectionate greetings and best wishes for their future welfare and happiness. May God's blessing rest upon them!

In its twenty-five years of existence, many gifts have been received by the Society, both of money and of chapel furnishings, tendered as memorials to loved ones now no longer with us. It seems fitting on this occasion to mention

them, and to express the hope that other donations will be added to them in the years that are to come: altar and repository for the Word; pipe organ; brass lectern; chapel bell; illumination of the panels in the reredos; mural tablet in memory of Dr. Wright, first minister of the Society; two stained glass windows; heavy silver-plated communion set of individual cups and trays; service flag; a suitably framed Roll of Honor of those who had been in some branch of service during the World War; ninety copies of the "Magnificat"; an unrestricted gift of fifty dollars; an unrestricted gift of two hundred and fifty dollars; a fund of five hundred dollars (the income to be used for the purchase of books for the Sunday school library); a fund of one hundred dollars (the income to be used for the gift of flowering plants to the children on Flower Sunday); a fund of one thousand dollars (the income to be used for the gift of Bibles each year for all children of the Sunday school who have reached the age of seven years, and for general expenses); a fund of two thousand dollars (the income to be used for general expenses); an Easter offering or "benevolent" fund (to be drawn upon at any time for any worthy object or purpose); and lastly, handsome wrought iron gates at the entrance to the chapel.

One perhaps unusual, but nevertheless characteristic feature of our little Society is the spirit of harmony that has always prevailed within its membership from its earliest beginning; for it can be truly said that no subject that has ever come up for discussion has caused any rancor or dissension. Yet we have not always thought alike, nor seen things eye to eye. Each one has wanted to do what was really for the greatest good of the Church. And, let me add, that we are very grateful for the efficient leadership of our much loved pastor, who has helped to bind us all together with cords of affection.

And now may I say in closing that it has been a very real pleasure to chronicle the birth and development of the Cambridge Society from its earliest and primitive place of

worship to its present attractive and commodious one. Our relations with the other six Protestant Churches of Old Cambridge have always been of the most friendly and cordial nature. We have every reason to expect they will continue to be so. In so far as our material welfare and prosperity is concerned, we have a permissible right to indulge in mutual felicitations. Whether or not we have used the talents that the Lord has given us to promote the spiritual life and faith of the Church in the ways that He would have us do, we make no boast of what we have done in the past twenty-five years; but we may be permitted to rejoice in the feeling that what we have accomplished will be of some enduring value. It would seem that our "plant," if we may so speak of it, is quite ample for the present needs of the School and the Society. But there are far-seeing men and women in the Church at large who anticipate the need of additional buildings and large endowments, if the work of educating men for the New-Church ministry is to progress in the future as it has in the past. Who knows but that in the year 1951 there will be held a meeting similar to the one we are now holding! If so, may we not hope that the historian on that occasion will to our deeds be more than kind, and to our faults a little blind. In any event, let us each and all earnestly resolve, with fresh dedication of our powers, to support and strengthen the Cambridge Society of the New Jerusalem, and to uphold the religious aims and purposes that were the guiding motives of its original founders.

CHARLES H. TAFT.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

NOTICE

The office of the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW (134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.) is in need of a few copies of the issues of the REVIEW for January 1925, April 1926, and January 1927. Return postage on single copies from any point within two zones of Boston is seven cents; and on two or three copies, is eight cents. May we ask some of our near-by subscribers who are through with their copies of any of these issues, to favor us?

THE IDEA OF GOD

The importance of the idea of God is generally recognized. History shows that it has played the supreme part in the course of human life; in the intellectual and moral no less than in the religious life of men. God and the world have been the two great objects of human interest and thought from the dawn of civilization; and man's interest in the world and his thought about the world have been largely determined by his idea of God. This means that religion has been and is the primal element and the constant motive force in man's proper life from the beginning. The idea of God is the center, and the supreme fact of religion. There may be fear, awe, the feeling of dependence in the idea of nature, of universal law, of an all-pervading presence, or of some form of universal being; but reverence, love, obedience, and adoration belong to the idea of God, and are produced by the presence and operation of God in the human soul.

It may be true that there has been a development of the idea of God with the development of mankind, more especially in

certain branches of the human race. But the enormous development of the natural sciences and mechanics, and the development of industrial and financial organization, have externalized men's interests and ways of thinking to such an extent as to weaken the influence of the idea of God and even endanger its very existence. This is sadly true of all classes; but it is alarmingly true of the educated, or miseducated, classes. In our colleges and institutions of learning belief in God weakens and disappears more and more as the students pass into the junior and senior grades. This tendency has been observable and has attracted the attention and efforts of observant and thoughtful people in recent years; but the same tendency seems to run through history. It is not merely due to the effect of education, but is a part of the atmosphere of worldliness which envelops and pervades the more complicated civilizations. The remedy is not a resort to obscurantism, but to more enlightened attention to the kind of education. Scientific education has an inevitable and prevailing tendency to naturalism and materialism, which may either become blatantly independent and self-assertive, or be held in subordination to religious motives and conventions. The only effective antidote to naturalism is religion; and religion depends upon the idea of God for its specific character and its proper direction.

In modern times the idea of God is very much complicated by importing into it philosophical considerations and problems. We have naturalistic, mystical, universalistic, and personalistic conceptions which lead to a tangle of metaphysical questions and difficulties. Besides these complications, the idea of God is richly endowed with the characters and qualities which are attached by applying the vocabulary of our modern civilization. In view of these complications, the idea of God is supposed to be a case of historical development, and of "evolution" from the primitive forms of the early ages of mankind. We cannot digress into the large field of natural history; but even if this field were thoroughly explored, we should still face the problem of origin. However difficult it might be to maintain historically the thesis that the idea of God came, and must come, by revela-

tion, we may say without question that, for Christendom at least, the idea of God comes from the Bible.

In the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, God is presented as the creator of heaven and earth; in other words, as the creator of the universe. The story goes on to give in detail the successive steps of the work of creation. From this point on, the character of creator is presented in its many varied relations to men and to the objects of nature. The character of creator comprehends all the aspects of the nature of God, and is therefore the most complete idea of God that we can have. In the second verse, we are told of the spirit of God. This introduces us to the idea of spirit, and gives to God the character of supreme and universal spirit, which is the real creator. In the first verse of the seventeenth chapter, we meet the idea of the Almighty. God as creator would be in fact almighty; so this attribute fills out the idea of God as creator. In the thirty-third verse of the twenty-first chapter, we read of the Everlasting God. Eternity is the character of transcendence and all comprehensiveness of God. As Eternal, God transcends the created universe, and grasps it in one view. In the first verse of the thirty-second chapter, we are told of the angel of God. The word "angel" introduces us to the thought of an inner and higher world, and of a higher and closer type of relationship with God.

Here, then, in the first book of the Bible, we have a very complete picture of the nature of God. When we collect the characters of creator, spirit, almighty, eternal, and fill out the implications of these terms, we have love, wisdom, power, providence, mercy, justice, personality, in fact all the characters that belong to God's perfection. Love is creative and expresses itself in creation; Love is in reality the Creator. Wisdom is Love's knowledge of the end and the means of creation. In other words, Love with its wisdom and its power is just what we mean by God, or just what God is. From Love follow, as its proper characters, providence, mercy, justice, personality, with all their particulars. But, it may be objected, these terms are understood very differently and very much more fully now

than they were by the men of old. This, in view of the legends of the Golden Age, is questionable; still in the light of recorded history suppose we grant it, due reflection shows that it is irrelevant. The point is that here the words are with the ideas for which they stand, to be interpreted in any age according to the capacity of the reader.

Furthermore, as we read on we find that "The Lord thy God is mercyful" and gracious, and that "we hear the voice of the Lord"; we read of "the blessing of the Lord thy God", that the Lord God is giver, that God is strength and power, that "His way is perfect"; that He is the Rock of Salvation; we read of the wisdom and glory of God, of the God of truth, of a just God and a Savior, of the Lord of hosts; and so on indefinitely. In short, if any one will take the Concordance and look up all the occurrences of the word "God" and its equivalents in the Bible, he will find that the idea of God is presented there with a wealth and a fulness not to be found in all the philosophies of the world. He will also find that the complete idea of God is presented in the first verse of the Bible, and that all the rest is a development of the implications and particulars of the idea of God as creator. It would seem that all possible human relationships with God and His dealings with men are presented there in beautiful literary form. The book of Psalms is especially rich in presenting the characters of God. It would not be too much to say that in the Psalms we have the richest storehouse of our knowledge of God to be found in any part of the Bible or elsewhere.

In the Bible, then, we have the materials of our theologies, and the source of our religious opinions and convictions. In the Bible we have the most complete statement of the idea of God. Various features of this idea are selected and emphasized now here and there in religious literature and in the opinions of men. A good example of this is a recent book entitled "My Idea of God" * edited by Joseph Fort Newton. Its sub-title is "A

* *My Idea of God:* A Symposium of Faith. Edited by Joseph Fort Newton, Litt. D., D.H.L. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1926. 286 pp., 8vo. $2.50 net.

Symposium of Faith". It consists of eighteen contributions of a selected list of representatives of as many points of view or sects.

> It is an extraordinary series of papers, in which Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, Modernist and Fundamentalist, Christian Scientist, Quaker, Ethical Culturist, Humanist, Empiricist, and Mystic tell us frankly and intimately, not why they believe in God, but in what terms they think of God.

As thus representative, the book is a good summary of current views, and presents fairly well what may be called the modern idea of God. As a matter of course, there is a wide range of style and content. Some of the papers are carefully thought out and well written; others are well written but emotional and sentimental,—for the most part records of personal religious experiences and opinions. The idea of God runs the gamut from definite affirmative statement to virtual negation, from rehearsal of tradition, well reasoned exposition of Biblical and Christian doctrine, to modernistic assertion of naturalism.

As a fair sample of current religious opinion and discussion, the book is instructive in showing that modern religious thought and expression is definitely and almost unanimously Unitarian. We are reminded of the reported saying of Thomas Jefferson, that in a few generations all Christians would be Unitarians. In spite of the fact that Christian doctrine early rejected Arianism, Unitarianism has persisted throughout the history of the Church. Trinitarian doctrine only emphasized the distinctness and the separateness of God and Christ. The difficulty from the beginning has been to think of Christ and God as one and the same person. The Unitarians have always insisted that, however fully Christ may have embodied the Spirit of God, He was still other than God. They agree that Christ was Divine, but they reject the idea that He was co-eternal with God the Father, according to the Trinitarian formula. Early Christian theology was a horrid tangle of metaphysical ideas; and yet this metaphysics gave directness and support to true Christian doctrine, in that it summarized fundamental characters of God, and at the same time preserved the idea of the Divinity of the Lord.

The most dangerous attack upon the ultimate validity of Christian doctrine was then and is now the naturalistic metaphysics of Unitarianism.

Arius, and his predecessors Lucian and Paul, struck at the heart of Christianity by asserting two propositions: (1) "The one God cannot appear substantially upon earth, and consequently that He cannot have become a person in Christ"; and (2) "The divine essence having become a person was other than the one God and of a nature foreign to Him". The meaning of these assertions is, that it is impossible and unthinkable that the one God should assume the human form and appear on earth as a human being; and that therefore Christ must be thought of as other than the one God. This is the essence of Unitarianism; and in spite of Trinitarian doctrine Christian thought has been in fundamental agreement with it. The Apostle Paul had said that "in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily"; but in other places he speaks of Christ as other than God. Even now with all their naturalism Unitarians can with slight qualification adopt Paul's language. They would prefer to express it in the form: "Christ was the full, or the fullest, manifestation of God's nature"; and this is the accepted formula for "orthodox" Christians. It is this formula that is asserted and reasserted throughout the book under review. It is the common characteristic of the essence of Christianity for all the contributors. This is a notable fact, and a hopeful symptom. The fact that the person and character of Christ has so completely won the attention and the homage of all Christians is of itself an historic fact of supreme importance in modern religion. But when we are giving critical attention to the modern idea of God, we must not close our eyes to the sharp difference which is made in modern thought between the one God and Christ; and this distinction is maintained not only in modern thought, but in modern, as well as in traditional, worship.

The one clear note in the book which is positively and distinctively Christian is struck in the paper entitled "Christ Glorified", by the Rev. Charles W. Harvey. In this paper it is maintained on historical and Scriptural grounds that Jesus

Christ glorified is the one only God. The attempt, however, to reconcile Trinitarian doctrine with this position is historically and logically futile. It is true that Swedenborg says that, if the doctrine had said three in the person of the Lord, it would have been in agreement with the truth; but the doctrine did not say that, and moreover it cannot be interpreted as saying that without shifting from the ground of Aristotelian metaphysics to that of spiritual interpretation. It is different in the case of the Scriptural grounds. Here a good case can be made out in the letter, and a clear and complete case can be made out in spiritual interpretation. But this does not remove the difficulties involved.

First we have the difficulty for natural thought of conceiving how the omnipresent, omnipotent, all-wise and all-loving, infinite God could take the form of a human personality; how "the Word became flesh". As to omnipresence, we may apply Swedenborg's principle that "The Divine is in all space apart from space, and in all time apart from time". This is a distinctive property of the Divine; and again Swedenborg's statement for it is "The Divine is the same in greatests and in leasts". In other words, the Divine is present as a whole in everything great and small. This is the meaning of omnipresence. We cannot, of course, say in space terms that the whole is contained in the part; but we can use such language of spiritual existence and presence. A familiar example of this is a melody. We say quite properly that the melody as a whole is present in each note, and that each note is a note of the whole melody. This is a peculiar property of the spirit. Plotinus way back in the third century of the Christian era maintained that the soul as a whole is present in the whole body and in every part of the body. We should not therefore be dismayed at the idea of omnipresence as an essential property of the Divine. We may, then, quite rightly think of God as uniquely present in the Child Jesus.

Another difficulty that natural thought has with the idea of God becoming man, is His infinity. We ask in awe, How could the infinite God be embodied in the form of Man? If God were infinite space or infinite time this would be unthinkable. But if

we think of God as infinite spirit, or rather as to the Divine, the law of mechanical or geometrical or physical part and whole does not apply. In other words, in the case of the infinite, it is strictly true to say that the part is equal to the whole. For example, in the case of the number system, the system of natural numbers can be divided into an infinite number of proper parts each equal to the whole. It is clear that the system of even numbers, or the system of odd numbers, is infinite and is demonstrably equal to the system of the natural numbers of which it is a proper part. Furthermore, the infinity of the number system is present in principle in each and every term of the series, in the law that each term shall have a next: it is this law that constitutes the series. We see that this law applies to the constitution of human life as soon as we observe that each affection, each thought, and each act calls for a next. This is due to the nature of love as a self-projective, self-representative, and self-realizing system. When we pass, therefore, from natural thought, space-time thought, the thought of bodies, to spiritual thought and to proper thought of the infinite, we may think of the infinite God as embodied uniquely in a human life. But it may be objected, How could God as a whole be in Christ, or *be* Christ, and at the same time be elsewhere throughout the universe? In asking this question we forget what we mean by omnipresence and infinity. To ask where God is or was, is to ask an irrelevant and inappropriate question. God is not contained in space, and has no position in space; nor in time. Omnipresence and infinity mean transcendence, with respect to space and time.

Perhaps the character of *omnipotence* offers the greatest difficulty in trying to think clearly of God in the human form. Some philosophers, Eucken, for example, maintain that it is absurd to think of God as man; and for this reason they expect Christianity to pass away as outgrown, and that a new religion, some kind of universalism, will take its place. The line of reasoning which leads to this conclusion is based mainly on the character of omnipotence. The question is, How could the power which directs and controls all things reside in a man?

The forces of nature, such as gravitation and electricity, are so vast and overwhelming that it seems incredible that they should be located in any type of personality. The problem here presented involves an elaborate philosophy of creation, with a thoroughgoing analysis of love and wisdom, and of personality. The attempt to even sketch such a philosophy would be out of place under the present circumstances. We may, however, glance at one or two considerations which will lead to some suggestions as to an approach to the difficulty of conceiving God as omnipotent. In the first place we must presuppose a careful survey of the description of God as contained in the Bible, and then begin with a statement of the results of theological reflection upon the idea of God so presented. We may gather from the book before us a fairly good statement of the traditional as well as the current idea of God. One statement is rather characteristic of modern thought. God is described as "a Presence", "the Unseen", the "One beyond", "the one all-pervasive Spirit of Life", "the Immanent Spirit of the universe", "the Spirit who rules and fills this and all other worlds", "the Spirit manifest in the energy and life and order and beauty of the universe, and in the thought and conscience and love of men, who comes to full self-expression in the Man Jesus Christ", "the self-revealing Father who unveils Himself in Jesus", and "the One Lord of heaven and earth". We pass here from a vague form of universalism and from the "negative theology", to the idea of spirit, universally immanent, and to the idea of self-revealing Father, supremely revealed in Jesus Christ.

One paper is an elaborate attempt, admirably articulated, and richly furnished, to say "What God Is". First, we have a statement of what God is not. "No physical thing, organic or inorganic, is God", neither is the sum total of physical things; the physical universe is not God. "Neither my real self nor my ideal self is God". "No other human person, historic or contemporary, is God"; nor humanity as a whole. "Humanity is to be served, nor worshiped; it is not even necessarily to be obeyed". "Moreover, all humanity is together dependent upon

an Other". "No mere idea in man's mind is God", not even the God-idea. "Neither is the totality of human ideals God". In short God is other than the world and other than man. To say what God is involves a distinction between the cosmic God and the God of religion. God is "Absolute Reality", the "Supreme Power", the "Something upon which we are all dependent", the "Conserver of absolute values", the "Universal Energy", the "Immanent Cause", "Reality as a Whole." These are the cosmic characters of God. They may be summed up under the head of Creator and Preserver of the universe and all things in it.

God for religion and as spiritual is the "Absolute Ideal", the ideal truth, beauty, and goodness; the "Ideal Companion of the inner life", the "Supreme Factor upon which we rely", the "Holy", the "Ideal Reality" (the ideal which actually exists), the "Supreme Moral Will", and "Moral Personality". These religious aspects of God may be summed up, though with some qualification, under the head of Divine Personality. The cosmic and the religious aspects may be brought together by thinking of God under the figure of a psychophysical organism. In other words, God may be thought of as Divine Body, Divine Life Force, and Divine Mind and Will. This analogy is inadequate, and may be misleading. God is really the spirit, not the body. The relation of God to human persons is better represented by the Supreme Spirit and a spiritual society. As a final result we have the idea of God as a "Personal Spiritual Life". This meager abstract does scant justice to the close and clear thinking exhibited in this statement. The idea of God presented meets many of the religious and rational demands. There is, however, a notable absence of emphasis upon the manifestation of God in Jesus Christ. Carrying with us this idea of God, cosmic and religious, we come back to the difficulty involved in the attempt to think clearly of God as omnipotent.

The first step is to think of God as Spirit, i.e., as love and wisdom; and the next step is to think of Him as Divine Love and Wisdom. In what we know as the force of will, we have abundant and familiar experience that the spirit exerts power. In fact, the force of will is the original source of our idea of

force and power. From this experience, the idea is transferred to the external world, and is serviceable for practical dealing with the external world. But the philosophy of science and of nature leads to the conclusion that force is not a needed or conceivable factor in the world of bodies treated mechanically, and that bodies in the ultimate analysis are nothing but centers of force. This means that the mechanical interpretation of the world is partial and provisional, and that a more complete understanding would restore the word force to its original meaning. We may therefore quite properly think of omnipotence without the embarrassment of the universe of mechanical and material bodies. We need not and cannot think of omnipotence as operating mechanically, but spiritually and Divinely, transcendently, as the spirit of man operates upon and in the body. The force of will is not limited in its own power, but in the capacity of the body to respond. In the case of omnipotence, the body is the external universe, and the outward limit of omnipotence is indefinitely removed. Omnipotence moves the world, but it is like the power of a great king, or a great general, or the head of a great corporation. The power of the king is everywhere present throughout his kingdom, but the king does not move from his place. His power is exerted through order and organization. The omnipotence of God is exerted through order, co-ordination, and organization, but God occupies no space and no place. Omnipotence is the power of the Divine Personality. We do not have to ask with incredulity, How could omnipotence operate throughout the universe and yet be the power of the personality of Christ? We have only to think of Christ Glorified as Divine in all respects, and His omnipresence, omnipotence, and infinity are involved.

We may ask, How could Christ as a child and a growing boy be actually Divine in the full sense of the word? The answer is that we are to think of Him as potentially and inwardly Divine during the period of His growth, but in and through the process of Glorification He became actually and completely Divine. This implies a temporary distinction in the person of Christ between His human and His Divine nature. This distinction

was gradually overcome, and the union of the two natures was completed. We think of God as Divine Love and Wisdom. These operated directly in and through the Child Jesus, and more and more fully with His growth. In the end, His love was without limit, and His wisdom was the wisdom of that love. Thus we may see that Christ Glorified was and is the one and only God. Infinity belongs to the nature of Divine Love; so do omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, and personality. Divine Love is the Supreme Person, and the source of all personality. Love is the Life of man, and the Life of all creation. Divine Love is the Creator and Preserver of the Universe, and the Redeemer and Regenerator of men. Christ Glorified is Divine Love.

LEWIS F. HITE.

A HUNDRED YEARS IN BROCKTON

Plymouth County, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, is the scene of much political history. It plays quite as large a part in the history of the New Church in this country. Today there mark it four societies of the New Church, those of Abington, Elmwood, Bridgewater and Brockton. They are all about a hundred years old; Brockton reached its centenary this year. It is one of the strongest societies of the Massachusetts Association, as well as one of the oldest.

Anniversary observances were held on a Saturday evening and on the following Sunday, March 19 and 20. Former ministers and their wives were in attendance, the ministers of the Association were largely represented, and there was a company swelled by many visitors that evening and on Sunday by the migration to Brockton of neighboring New-Church societies. In only a few centers the world over can such easy aggregations of New-Church societies be effected. On the Sunday there were services morning and afternoon, with a celebration of the Supper, the Rev. H. Clinton Hay, a former minister, preaching in the morning, and the Rev. Louis G. Hoeck, another prede-

cessor of the Rev. Russell Eaton, giving the sermon in the afternoon.

On the Saturday evening the observances took a form which brought out the history of the Society, and some of the lessons of that history, the most readily. Greetings from other societies of the Association were extended by a succession of speakers occupying but a few minutes each; and with that, in addresses from some of the former ministers, and from the Rev. John Goddard (who hailed from Brockton originally), and from the President of Convention, the company was carried happily and rewardingly over some of the life and career of the Brockton Society. The REVIEW, as it goes to press, adds its felicitations, and may well take note of such an occasion. We think, too, that members of the Church at large will enjoy and perhaps profit by a good deal that was said on the Saturday evening (the only meeting which the writer was able to attend).

The thought was soon suggested how little one hundred years are in the advancement of a cause on which no limit of time can be set. The minister of the Bridgewater Society was able to refer to the Brockton Society as the child of the former, for its formation came by way of the group in Bridgewater, which is slightly older than Brockton. Indeed, the cause is not out of the pioneer days yet—a reflection which the President of the Convention was to take up in a highly pertinent fashion at the close of the meeting. A century is only a good start for a society serving the cause of a new Christian era. There went with that thought a wholly joyous feeling; nothing was coming to the end of its strength, as a human life decidedly would be doing. The Society had in that time only proved and tried its strength. This congratulatory feeling a former minister tempered with a tender reference to days and tasks that were over, and to workers who had done their part, and gone to their places in the world above. And with that another former minister came out with recollections of the children that had grown up during his ministry or since, and with expressions of gratification at the energy and competency with which he now found them making places for themselves in the world, and, he trusted, with

interest, in the Church. The mosaic of the Society's career got pieced together slowly, and it was amazing to see with what completeness before the speaking was done. Each speaker, with nothing more than a natural adoption of his own point of view, spoke to something different in the history of the Society.

Mrs. Sperry represented her husband, another former minister, at present away on a mission to New-Church circles in Europe, and added, not only the charm of her own poise to the meeting's accumulating impressions, but almost the sole touch of the fraternity with the other churches in the city which the Brockton Society, after early days of isolation, has enjoyed. Mr. Hay had also spoken of friendly relationships.

The Rev. John Goddard, *emeritus* though he be, and though humorously he interprets that to mean "devoid of merit", never spoke with more clarity, or a surer felicity, or a sweeter appeal. He is not a former minister of the Society, but a fairly early member of it, his childhood days and youth spent in Brockton, and his relatives conspicuous in the Society's affairs and pulpit. Indeed, there was reason for a listener at the meeting Saturday night to ask now and then, "Is this the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Brockton Society, or is it a Goddard family re-union, and are they all centenarians?" For the history of the New Church thereabouts can be pretty well reproduced in the terms of the labors of the Goddard family there. Mr. Goddard's words, intimate and easy, were largely of the old days in Brockton. The scenes of his childhood were brought to life around us as we listened. His impressions from that time, their tenacity and their elevating power, he took to illustrate the force and value of those beginnings of spiritual character in childhood to which the teaching gives the name "remains". Was it ever more obvious that these implanted ideas and stirrings of the life of the spirit do remain, than it was as this venerable dean of our ministry spoke of them; yes, did more, lived them over again after all these years? There was one especially charming recollection. Mr. Goddard from childhood has always associated heaven with the West! What bad doctrine! But what admirable piety binding the years, and

what lifelikeness! Only to the west of his early home in Brockton was there open space; only to the west was there nature untouched; only to the west was there nothing put up by the hand of man. And there the child-mind moved in that celestial light with which once meadow, grove and stream were apparelled.

The competent Secretary of the Society, who has served a little more than a quarter of the Society's life, commented with drollery on some of the characteristics of past records and recorders, a particularly amusing bit being the comment on the first secretary of all, who after meticulously written-out minutes, let you know by the flourish with which he set down his name and office that he was "not all in" by any means!

Of course there had been talks of the early men and women of the New Church in the vicinity, their enterprise, their faithfulness, their capacity for sacrifice, their courage. It remained for the President of Convention to speak more directly to these good qualities, and to urge the thought that in these days, easier for the cause in many ways, all these strong qualities would probably be in as much demand as ever, did we attempt to live up to the requirements which the spiritual life today lays on us. Mr. Goddard, as he reminded the meeting, had already spoken of grasping the demand on us in the terms of a life, and not only of a philosophy about life. Mr. Worcester went on to urge that, if we set out to make real in our own spirits and behavior the life to which the Lord calls in His Second Coming, if we fare forth to stand for the motives, ways and spirit of that life in all the affairs of the world with which we have to do,—affairs of the nation, and even affairs of the nations,—we should in all likelihood find that none of the old-time courage was amiss, none of the former self-sacrifice beside the mark, none of the early perseverance unneeded. It was a direct, strong utterance; it gathered up, in conclusion of the meeting, employing them for the present and the future, the momentum and power of the past. It did for the Society what Mr. Goddard's appealing words did for the individual life.

Are there any more useful injunctions that can come to us

out of the past than these? In many quarters of Christendom in this land there is today the desire and the purpose to make earnest, as men say, with Christ, both in the life of the individual and in the affairs of human society. There are many workers in the field, wearing various names, seeking this same harvest. They have ventured out, a number of them, before we were prompted to do so. Certainly they have seen opposition, and had to make sacrifices, and to keep up their courage. Any application of Christian standard to our lives and to our conduct is bound to see opposition; on a larger scale so does the attempted application of it to the problems and to the social structure which enter into the environment of us all. But the effort to bring human society more nearly into the human form, as the teaching puts it, or into the Divine human form, as it interprets the Lord's Prayer to be putting it,—that effort is on. It will take courage, and probably some sacrifice, and also thinking, to take our place in that effort. In *thinking* we have one more early good quality that might be added to the list. These societies of the New Church in Plymouth County sprang from the boldness of one man, the Rev. Holland Weeks. He was ministering at Abington, to a society of Congregationalists. He manifested an interest in the teachings of the New Church. Persecution followed, and a heresy trial; and he was cast out of his fellowship. He became an effective missionary of the New Church, by little more than this step, in Massachusetts, and by years of work in Maryland and Virginia and in upper New York State. In addition to courage, and self-sacrifice, and perseverance, Mr. Weeks had a quality which we do not mention so often, but of which we should probably make more. Never would he, with whatever courage, or fidelity, or capacity for self-sacrifice, have made the beginnings he did, or taken the step he did, had he not in the first place had independence of thought. Is that quality not needed by us as much today? Not so much independence of the thought of those around us; for in that respect the days have grown easier; we are allowed mental room to work in; but independence of ways in which we ourselves have come habitually to think, and to work, so that

we can make a new start, and grasp our message and our ways of proffering it with a due power for the day? One thing anniversary occasions always do which is not helpful. Assembling the numbers they do, and running high with the spirit of a festive occasion, they conceal the indifference, the small numbers, the failing effectiveness of method, which are apparent from week to week. We must not forget the steady condition. The Secretary of the Society, with a dash of courage on his part, read some figures which do not mean growth, at any rate, to put the matter no more strongly. Is there a chance that among other things to be urged on us is a re-conception of message and of method of work, independence of our own established ways of thinking and doing? An independence of thought with which the first spirit of inquiry will come again, in place of the habit of assertion and recitation? Would the New Church have got started in these days which we celebrate on such an occasion like Brockton's centenary, if, in addition to courage, self-sacrifice, and fidelity, there had not been a very sizable quantity of independence of thought in our spiritual forebears? Fidelity to the cause may well take the form of a readiness to revise our ways of understanding and advancing it.

William F. Wunsch.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

THE WALLS, GATES AND FOUNDATIONS OF THE HOLY CITY

The Holy City with men is a new kind of life in politics, in industry, in education, in marriage, in the home, and in recreation and pleasure. And this new life which makes the Holy City with men, is one that looks to the Lord and to the spiritual teachings of the Word for its enlightenment and for the spiritual motives from which it acts.

And the "walls" of this City, or this new life in the world, are the principles that are found in the literal sense of the Word that are capable of defending the higher forms of spiritual feeling and thought and conduct that are represented by the life within the Holy City itself. But these principles from the literal sense that make the "walls" of the City, must meet certain requirements, for the "walls" are said to be, first, "great and high", then, it is added, that they measured one hundred and forty-four cubits, the "measure of a man, that is, of an angel", and finally, that "the building of the wall of it was of jasper". The wall is "great and high" because these principles that are taken from the letter of the Word to make the wall, must tell us not only what it is right for us to think in protecting our spiritual life, but also, what it is right for us to feel and to do. "The Lord our God is one Lord", "I have all power in heaven and in earth", "I and the Father are one", "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path", "Great peace have they who love thy law", are some pieces of "jasper" that go into the making of the wall. And this wall is one hundred and forty-four cubits high and the "measure of a man, that is, of an angel" because those in the Holy City recognize as Divine these principles that make the walls of their City; and that when they are lived, it makes men and women human, and associates

them with the angels of heaven. And the walls are built of "jasper". Just what precious stone is here meant is not certain. In Hasting's "Dictionary of the Bible" it is stated on the authority of Pliny that the "jasper" was a green shade of chalcedony. Some think that the diamond is meant because it is said of the Holy City that "her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone clear as crystal". Swedenborg speaks of it as a "bright-white" stone (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 213). But in any case, the "jasper" was, first, a precious stone, and second, it was mineral body in the crystallized state of aggregation. The jasper being a precious stone expresses the fact that those who are in this Holy City, that is, those who live this new spiritual life in the world, see in the principles of the letter of the Word the deeper spiritual teaching of the inner meaning. This spiritual sense for these men of the Holy City shines through the letter of the Word and gives the letter a new light and meaning. Jasper being a crystallized mineral body expresses this further truth that these principles of the letter of the Word, that make up these walls of the Holy City, are teachings that are not mere abstractions; for Swedenborg's teaching about crystals is, that they represent "truths of faith from good" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9872); that is, these protecting walls for our Holy Cities are only built from the spiritual principles of the letter of the Word that have been used by us in the protecting of, and defense of, spiritual life. Such truth is jasper, "clear as crystal", and not mere sand or common stone. When, in time of trial and despair, we actually look to the Lord as God, the words "The Lord also will be a refuge for the oppressed, a refuge in times of trouble" become changed into "jasper" and built into some part of our wall of the Holy City.

"And the wall had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel". These "gates" are the principles from the Word that introduce men into this new spiritual life in politics, business, the home, and in the life of the world in general. The principles in the Ten Commandments, and the principle that the Lord alone saves from sin, would be

such "introductory truths". But these gates were made of twelve pearls, "every several gate was of one pearl". Pearls, in general, are calcareous concretions built up around invading parasites or foreign bodies in the pearl-bearing oyster. The irritating invader is covered over with layer after layer of pearl forming material, resulting usually in a spherical shaped form with characteristic colors of a delicate hue. The "pearl of great price" is the knowledge about the Lord, and, especially, about His saving power, as this knowledge is acquired in the actual effort to repulse evil and selfish life. So the gates of our Holy City would be the knowledge that we gain in regard to the Lord and His power and love of saving men, as we make use of the "introductory" teachings of the Word, as, for example, the Commandments, to repel forms of selfish thought and feeling forbidden by these Commandments. Using principles of this character, from unselfish motives, leads us to see that all the spiritual teaching of the Word leads the thought to more and more complete knowledge about the Lord, and this more complete knowledge reveals the fundamental unity in all the teachings of the Word about the Lord and spiritual life. "Every several gate was of one pearl".

The gates being three on each side of the City, or twelve in all, expresses the truth that men enter the new spiritual life that the New Jerusalem represents in the world, with varying degrees of intelligence and unselfish love of the Lord and of men, and with differing experiences with the Lord's saving power, as this power is made known, for example, by the spiritual use of the Ten Commandments.

The twelve angels over the gates, and the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel being inscribed "within" the gates, teaches the truth that these introductory principles of the Word contain within them descriptions of spiritual feeling and thought and life such as are experienced in heaven, and, in part, experienced by the man who is led by the Lord into this new spiritual life in the world that is the life of the Holy City. These angels and these names mean, too, that this new spiritual life of the Holy City is guarded by the Divine Providence so that only

those find their way into it who can be led by the Lord from unselfish motive into its new light and new experiences of love for the Lord and for men.

When we come to think of the foundations of the walls of the Holy City, we must observe, first, that there were twelve of them; second, that there was written on them, not the names of the twelve tribes of Israel that we find on the gates of the City, but the names "of the twelve apostles of the Lamb"; and, finally, we must note that these foundations are crystalline bodies in the form of precious stones.

The twelve foundations, we are taught in the "Apocalypse Revealed", n. 902, are the doctrines of the New Church that are drawn from the literal sense of the Word; for "the church is also founded upon doctrine, for doctrine teaches how one must believe and how he must live". But this doctrine that is drawn from the literal sense of the Word, is the body of principles that are drawn from this sense as it is illuminated for the spiritually minded man, by the inner, spiritual teaching of the Word. For, we must recall, that these foundation stones are crystalline bodies; and then that they are precious stones. Crystals, we have learned, mean "truths of faith from good"; and

> By a precious stone, when treating of the Word, is signified the Divine truth of the Word in the literal sense *translucent* [italics ours] from the Divine truth in the spiritual sense. . . . That it (the jasper) was translucent, is because the Divine Truth in the literal sense is in natural light, and the Divine Truth in the spiritual sense is in spiritual light; and therefore when the spiritual light flows in into the natural light with a man who is reading the Word, he is enlightened, and sees the truths therein; for the objects of spiritual light are truths. (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 911.)

This seems to teach us that the foundations for this new spiritual life in the world are principles drawn from the literal sense of the Word by a spiritually minded man whose mind is enlightened by the spiritual sense, and who can appreciate the value of this sense for the purposes of spiritual living. But, further, Swedenborg writes in the "Arcana Cœlestia", n. 1055, that the "universal heaven is *founded* on love" [italics ours];

and so this Holy City must be founded in experiences of unselfish love.

But this is not all. This doctrine that makes the new spiritual life in the world has written in it "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb". When we take these Scriptural words in connection with the statement from the "Arcana Cœlestia" that "without an influx of innocence from the Lord during this first age [that is, the age of infancy] there would never be anything *fundamental*" [italics ours], we see that these doctrines or principles that make the foundation for this new type of spiritual life in the world must have a common characteristic, namely, that they require innocent thought and innocent feeling for their appreciation and effective use. And innocence, we recall, is defined for us as willingness "to be led by the Lord and not by self" (Heaven and Hell, n. 280). Forms of teaching and feeling that encourage self-assertiveness and conceit and egotism, effectively destroy the foundations of the Holy City, and leave us without spiritual life and heaven.

But coming now to the different stones of the foundations of this Holy City, we meet with many difficulties in regard to both the meaning of the terms of the original text and the interpretation of the language of the Writings. With the exception of one or two cases, it is not certain just what stones are meant by the Greek text, and how the ancient stone differs from the modern stone of the same name. But with Swedenborg's help, and with his direct reference to chapter seven of the Book of Revelation where the meaning of the twelve tribes is the same as the meaning of the twelve foundation stones, we are able to arrive at some conclusions, and to group the stones of the foundation in four groups of three stones each, as shown in the following chart.

THE TWELVE TRIBES (REV. 7) AND THE TWELVE FOUNDATION STONES (REV. 21)

Group I

TRIBE	STONE	NOTES ON THE STONES
Judah	Jasper	Diamond (?). Green transparent chalcedony—opaque compact quartz, red, brown, yellow, green.

Reuben	Sapphire (R. V. margin, "or lapis-lazuli")	(Pliny) opaque stone, azure color refulgent with spots of gold. This is lapis-lazuli, a silicate of calcium, aluminum and sodium. Modern sapphire (?) Al_2O_3 color due to oxides of Ti, Fe, Cr.
Gad	Chalcedony	Fibrous silica, translucent or transparent; fibres are microscopical crystals. Great variety of colors.

Group II

TRIBE	STONE	NOTES ON THE STONES
Asher	Emerald	Green rock crystal of quartz (Flinders Petrie) — Swedenborg has emerald a green stone. Modern emerald has composition: $3BeO.Al_2O_3.6SiO_2$ (Dana). Others think some red, fiery stone.
Naphtali	Sardonyx	(Hastings' D. B.) A variety of onyx or banded silica with red layers of sardius. Swedenborg: pellucid, flesh colored stone (Adver.)—An onyx with sard or carnelian (Ency. Brit.).
Manasseh	Sardius	(Hastings' D. B.) Carnelian (semi-transparent silica colored red by oxide of iron). Petrie: red jasper which is opaque. Swedenborg: a red stone—cel. love of good. "Ruby" in O. T.

Group III

TRIBE	STONE	NOTES ON THE STONES
Simeon	Chrysolite	(Hastings' D. B.) Golden colored stone, yellow quartz, yellow corundum—yellow topaz. Modern stone, a silicate of magnesium (Ency. Brit.). Married pair from 3rd heaven (M.42), wife has rosary hanging from necklace that is of chrysolite. Necklace of carbuncles and bracelets of pearls.
Levi	Beryl	Eng. Ver. has onyx. Beryl is a silicate of aluminum and beryllium. Has a wide range of tints from yellow through green to blue. (Hastings' D. B.) Commonest form of crystal has six sides. (Ency. Brit.) Beryl includes aquamarine, emerald, pink beryl; some cases it is colorless. Swedenborg: "Bright white from azure" (A. C. 9872).

Issachar	Topaz	(Hastings' D. B.) The "peridote" (yellowish green silicate of magnesium). (Ency. Brit.) Colors, yellow, blue, brown, probably chrysolite. Swedenborg: has "red and flaming color" (A. C. 9865).

Group IV

TRIBE	STONE	NOTES ON THE STONES
Zebulun	Chrysoprase	(Hastings' D. B.) A leek-green chalcedony. May have been a form of beryl (silica). Green color from oxide of nickel. Swedenborg: Color from blue which from red. (A. C. 9868).
Joseph	Jacinth (R. V. margin, "or sapphire")	(Hastings' D. B.) Modern sapphire or blue corundum. Modern jacinth, a silicate of zircon. Swedenborg: Jacinth—intelligence from spiritual love (A. R. 450).
Benjamin	Amethyst	This is our amethyst of quartz (silica) crystal, transparent and colored by manganese and iron. The color is purple. Swedenborg: Amethyst signifies the spiritual love of good. (A. C. 9870).

In the first group we find the stones "jasper", "sapphire", and "chalcedony", and the three corresponding tribes of "Judah", "Reuben", and "Gad". In this list of tribes, Judah, who represents the love of the Lord, comes first, teaching us that, in the new spiritual life in the world that the Holy City means, this love will be the central and characteristic motive of all forms of unselfish purposes of the Church. The "jasper" would represent the doctrine from the Word that teaches us about this love of the Lord; for example, the story of the Garden of Eden, the life of Abraham, and the words "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind". The wisdom of this love of the Lord that these stories of the Garden of Eden and of Abraham reveal, and the practical expressions of this love in the life of the world, would be represented by the tribes of Reuben and Gad, and, in principle, represented by the "sapphire" and "chalcedony".

When we come to the second group, we come to the description of the forms of mutual love, and love of society, and to the perceptions and actions growing out of this love that characterize the life of the highest or "celestial" heavens. "Asher" means this mutual love, this unselfish love of society and the community. "Naphtali" is the "perception of use" in this heaven, and of this mutual love; that is, he is the guiding agency in the performance of the uses of the mutual love of this heaven. And the "uses" themselves are represented by "Manasseh". The stones that go with these tribes, and represent the "principles" of which the tribes are the living examples, are the "emerald", the "sardonyx", and the "sardius". These stones would be the principles that are drawn from the descriptions of celestial life in the Word which describe how the love of the Lord expresses itself in mutual love and in the love of society and the community. The stories cited above, of Eden, and of Abraham, would contain the "principles" about mutual love and the love of society and the community that these stones represent.

With these two groups of six tribes and six precious stones, we pass from the life of the highest heaven to that of the second or spiritual heaven; or, we pass to descriptions of lower forms of spiritual love and teaching that make up the doctrine and life of the Holy City in the world. And in the third group we have "Simeon", "Levi", and "Issachar", and for stones the "chrysolite", "beryl", and the "topaz". This group of tribes describes the nature of the unselfish love of the neighbor, the intelligence of this love, and the life or conduct and behavior of this love. The group of precious stones that go with these tribes would be the principles taken from the literal and inner meaning of those Commandments that deal with the love of the neighbor; the principles of the deeper sense of the stories of Noah and Isaac, the parable of the Good Samaritan, and so on.

In the last group of three tribes are "Zebulun", "Joseph", and "Benjamin", and the three stones that are associated with them are the "chrysoprasus", "jacinth", and "amethyst". This final group represents the external life of the spiritual heavens, or

the more external forms of love of the neighbor and the intelligence of such love that will be found in the teaching and life of the Holy City. (See Apocalypse Revealed, n. 363.) In this part of the spiritual heavens, or of the life of the Holy City, intelligent thought about what the love of the neighbor means and requires is made the chief interest; then the practice of what this intelligent thought teaches, follows it. And central in this intelligent thought about what love of the neighbor means, is the thought about the principle that spiritual life means applying spiritual principles to practical and concrete life from unselfish motive. "Zebulun" comes first in this group. The principles in the Word about God, the nature of the spiritual life, immortality, the Church, and so on, when intelligently thought about, would be represented by the three remaining stones of the foundations of the City.

But before we close, it is perhaps suggestive to note, that many of the precious stones of this foundation are either pure silica, or compounds containing silica. But silica in the non-crystalline form is one of the constituents of clay, which, Swedenborg says, "signifies the goods of which the mind or the man of the Church is formed . . . or the good of charity" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1300). The silica, in the crystallized form of the precious stones of the Holy City, very likely represents a higher form of unselfish love of men than is represetned by common clay. This is borne out by the important statement made in the "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 362, where Swedenborg explains the omission of the tribe of Dan from the list of the twelve tribes of Israel, saying, that Dan "could not signify anything in the Lord's New Heaven and New Church, where will be only the heavenly (celestial) and the spiritual". And, further, the clay and the spittle with which the Lord anointed the eyes of the blind man (John 9:6) represented "reformation by means of truths from the sense of the letter of the Word", and, in this case, the reformation of "those born outside of the Church" (Apocalypse Explained, n. 239:18). The silica in the precious stones would then be forms of teaching from the Word about unselfish life, in which the spiritually intelligent man of

the Holy City may see something of the deeper wisdom of the inner sense shining through. And it is interesting to note that the intercellular fluids or plasmas of the human body contain traces of silica. In the vegetable kingdom, silica gives strength and rigidity to the outer coatings of the stalks of grain. In homeopathic medical practice, silica is a deep and long-acting remedy, giving stamina to weak and exhausted patients, especially following long and exhausting mental application. If, too, there are clusters of foci of infection in the body, or improperly or incompletely cured wounds or ulcers, this remedy will suppurate these things out, and then heal the diseased tissues in a healthy and normal way. So, very likely, does this spiritual principle, represented by silica, act upon the spiritual life of men.

WARREN GODDARD.

WHAT USE CAN WE MAKE OF SWEDENBORG'S MEMORABLE RELATIONS?

At the end of the chapters of his theological works entitled "Apocalypse Revealed", "Conjugial Love", and the "True Christian Religion", Swedenborg has given us graphic word-pictures of his experiences in the spiritual world from things heard and seen there by him. These word-pictures or descriptions of the other world he called *memorabilia,* a word which we have translated Memorable Relations.

Perhaps no parts of his theological works are so little read and appreciated by the average New-Churchman as are the Memorable Relations. Readers have told me that they enjoy reading the book "Heaven and Hell", which is also an account of things heard and seen by Swedenborg in the spiritual world, but for some reason or other they cannot read with any enjoyment or satisfaction his Memorable Relations. Some of them have freely said that they believe that the Memorable Relations actually repel persons, and keep them from accepting the teachings of the New Church, because they are so fanciful and

fantastic, and run counter to what people expect to find in books on theology.

How many in number these persons are in the New Church who never read the Memorable Relations and who believe that they hinder the reception of its teachings, I do not know; but I have reasons for believing that they are not a few. Most of them would, I believe, read and enjoy them, if they knew their purpose, and how to interpret or understand them.

Ever since the Memorable Relations were written, they have been the object of much criticism and doubt. Even in Swedenborg's day there were certain persons who objected to them, and tried to persuade him not to include or to insert them in his theological works. Among these was Count Hopken, Swedenborg's friend and admirer. In his letter to General Tuxen, Hopken wrote as follows:

> I once represented, in rather a serious manner, to this venerable man (Swedenborg), that I thought he would do better not to mix his beautiful writings with so many memorable relations, or things heard and seen in the spiritual world concerning the states of men after death, of which ignorance makes a jest and derision. But he answered me, that this did not depend on him; that he was too old to sport with spiritual things, and too much concerned for his eternal happiness to yield to such foolish notions, assuring me, on his hopes of salvation, that imagination produced in him none of his revelations, which were true, and from what he had heard and seen (Tafel's Documents, No. 252).

And in a letter which Count Hopken wrote to "a friend", we find much the same thoughts expressed. In this letter Hopken wrote:

> Of Swedenborg's Memorable Relations I cannot judge, not having had any spiritual intercourse myself by which to judge of his assertions either approvingly or disapprovingly; but they cannot appear more extraordinary than the Apocalypse of John, and other similar relations contained in the Bible. . . . I know that Swedenborg has related his memorabilia *bona fide*. I asked him once, why he wrote and published these memorable relations, which seemed to throw so much ridicule on his doctrine, otherwise so rational; and whether it would not be best for him to keep them to himself, and not to publish them to the world. But he answered, that he had orders from the Lord to publish them; and that those who might ridicule him on that account would do him injustice; for said he, why should I who am a man in years render

myself ridiculous for fantasies and falsehoods (Tafel's Documents, No. 252).

Now what Count Hopken says in these letters is in full agreement with what Swedenborg himself says in his theological works concerning his experiences in the spiritual world, as may be seen from n. 851 of the "True Christian Religion", where we find him saying:

I foresee that many who read the *Memorabilia* appended to each chapter of this work, will believe them to be the inventions of imagination. But I declare in truth that they are not inventions, but were truly seen and heard: not seen and heard in some state of the mind in sleep, but in a state of complete wakefulness. For it has pleased the Lord to manifest Himself to me, and to send me to teach those things which of necessity belong to His New Church, which is meant by the New Jerusalem in the Revelation. For this purpose He has opened the interiors of my mind or spirit, whereby it has been permitted me to be with angels in the spiritual world, and at the same time with men in the natural world, and this now for twenty-seven years. Who in the Christian world would have known anything of heaven and hell, unless it had pleased the Lord to open the spiritual sight of some one, and to show and teach him? That such things as are described in the above *Memorabilia* do appear in the heavens, is evident from similar things seen and described by John in the Revelation, and also by the prophets in the Word of the Old Testament. [See also Conjugial Love, n. 1, and Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 67-71.]

Swedenborg's solemn assertions that his Memorable Relations are neither fiction nor due to an overwrought imagination, but that they are descriptions of things actually heard and seen by him, ought to have great weight with all New-Church people, and lead them to study the Relations affirmatively.

The objection that some persons raise against the Memorable Relations, namely, that they hinder the reception of his teachings by many who would otherwise receive those teachings, has, I believe, some truth behind it. I believe they do keep at a distance from the New Church some who seem to be disposed to accept the doctrines of the New Church elsewhere disclosed by him in his theological works. This is not said in condemnation of the Memorable Relations, but only as a statement of fact. We may wish this were not so; we may wish that there were none who needed to be kept distant. Nevertheless is it not true that the Lord does place cherubim with flaming swords in

their hands to protect the way of the tree of life? In fact have we not ourselves many a time become conscious of their presence and of their stopping the way before us?

The protection of spiritual truth is then one of the uses performed by the Memorable Relations; but they have other uses as well. One of these is that of illustration. The Memorable Relations illustrate some of the important truths taught in the chapters to which they are appended. A third use, not very unlike the one just mentioned, is that of setting before our minds a picture of the truths previously taught as pure doctrine; in other words, the Memorable Relations present to us the truth in concrete form, or in a form that is in strict correspondence with it. A fourth use, closely related to the last two mentioned, is that of enabling us to visualize the spiritual world, and the effect that good and truth or evil and falsity have on human life. Then they help us to think of the spiritual world as a real substantial world, having all the characteristics of a world suited to man; they also help us to think of those who live there as being real human beings, and not formless essences, disembodied ghosts or wraiths, of which no clear idea can be formed.

In his work entitled "Heaven and Hell", Swedenborg teaches very clearly that the spiritual world is a real substantial world, and that those who live there are in the human form, and possess senses similar to those we possess; but these statements gain vividness and distinctness in our minds when read in conjunction with the Memorable Relations, for in the latter the truth is presented much more concretely. To me the Memorable Relations have always been a series of word-pictures, in which I see good and evil, truth and falsity, and their effects upon the soul, made visible or apprehensible because embodied in outward form. To many persons good and evil, truth and falsity, are mere abstractions; but to those who read the Memorable Relations, and grasp with some degree of fulness their meaning, good and evil, truth and falsity, become entities in that they are seen to be states of life in man, states actually determining his character, use, place, and form.

And the last use which the Memorable Relations perform of which I wish to make mention, is that of helping us to understand the Divine Word. Much that is to be found in the Divine Word took place in the spiritual world. The book of Revelation, the prophecies of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Zechariah, are largely the accounts of things heard and seen in that world; and they sound not less strange and fanciful in the ears of the average person than do Swedenborg's Memorable Relations; and they remain so until something of the nature of the spiritual world, and of the laws which are operative there, is learned. Here is where Swedenborg's revelations of the spiritual world come in and help us. They help us to understand much that is written in the Word of the Lord which we would not be able to understand without such a revelation.

In the "Spiritual Diary", n. 4123, Swedenborg writes "the things revealed to me are instead of miracles"; and in the little work on the "Miracles" he says:

> In place of miracles, there has, at this day, taken place a manifestation of the Lord Himself, an intromission into the spiritual world, and enlightenment there by immediate light from the Lord in such things as are interior things of the church.

These are remarkable statements for him to make of his own revelations; in fact they are startling. In what sense are his revelations in place of miracles? The miracles which our Lord performed while here on the earth served many uses. One of these was to make concrete to those who witnessed them the healing or redemptive nature of His outflowing life or virtue, and of the Word that He preached. I believe that Swedenborg's revelations, including his Memorable Relations, perform a similar use, in that they illustrate spiritual truth, and make visible to our minds the nature of the Word of the Lord, and of the power that proceeds from it.

What use then can we make of Swedenborg's Memorable Relations? We can use them to illustrate the lessons we are trying to bring to our hearers. If we are talking about the heavenly life as a life of use, we might refer to, or quote from, the first Memorable Relation in the work entitled "Conjugial

Love". If we are considering the holiness of marriage, there are many of the Memorable Relations which we might use with great effect. If our topic is the New Church and the place of reason in the life of the New Church, we can make use of the Memorable Relation in the "True Christian Religion", n. 508, in which Swedenborg mentions a temple he beheld in the spiritual world, over the gate of which was written *"Nunc Licet"*. In fact we can find much in his Memorable Relations to illustrate and to reinforce the lessons we are trying to impart. Again, the Memorable Relations can be used in Sunday school instruction, to illustrate some teaching, and to make the truth more concrete. Those who have children in their homes need to be told of the Memorable Relations, and of their use for children. Little children will be interested in them, for they like to hear stories that have action and color; and many of the Memorable Relations have a great deal of both. Further, they may be recommended to the Woman's Alliance and the American New Church League as a suitable course of study. And we can draw the attention of all who are interested in psychical research to them, as something well worth their careful examination and study.

At present the New Church seems to be doing little in making Swedenborg's Memorable Relations better known and understood. It is true that in 1901 a number of them were collected and published in book form as Volume 3 of the Doctrinal Series of the Manuals of Religious Instruction. Some years previous the Rev. Benjamin F. Barrett published some of them as Volume 10 of the Swedenborg Library; and in 1907 the Rev. O. L. Barler published his book "Degrees of Life in Man", in which a number of them were used. But aside from these efforts little seems to have been done to acquaint our members with the Memorable Relations, and to help them to understand them rightly. If the Memorable Relations perform the uses I have mentioned, they ought to be brought from time to time to the attention of our people, and to that of others as well.

C. Edgar Ritter.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?"*

Dr. Cave's "The Doctrine of the Person of Christ" will be of interest to the New-Church student or layman, even though his interest extend simply to knowing what has been thought down the Christian centuries on this supreme subject, and to knowing what is being thought today in Christendom at large. In language "that a layman can understand" Dr. Cave has done an admirable summary of the development of Christian thought on the topic, and a helpful survey of current discussion. When one recalls that a work like Dorner's on the subject runs to five large volumes, one wonders at the conciseness of this handbook of 250 pages.

Still more highly will the New-Church student value this book who feels that he needs this knowledge for the due setting of his own teaching on the subject. Decidedly there are two ways of taking up a teaching of the New Church. One can consider it a thing apart. One can study it isolated from all other discussion. His interest in other discussion will be to draw on it for occasional illustration, perhaps, or for contrast, or, less happily, only to controvert it. The other procedure is to take up the teaching of the New Church as the crown, indeed, of Christian teaching, but for that reason in its setting in the whole body of Christian thought on the subject. There will be truth to reckon with in that whole body of thought, and truth to incorporate as a substantial part of that teaching. Anything worthy of the name of theological study must surely be of this latter order. And while the close student will want to turn to larger and more detailed works on the Person of

**The Doctrine of the Person of Christ.* By Sydney Cave, M.A., D.D., President of Cheshunt College, Cambridge. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1925. 259 pp., 12 mo. $1.75.

Christ, this relatively simple account and survey of Dr. Cave's will serve as a handy summary, or as a first introduction to the whole field. At the back of the book there is an extensive bibliography, divided up to go with the successive chapters.

As the New-Church student goes down over the developing thought of Christian study on the subject, beginning with the varied and provocative pictures which the Gospels themselves offer of the Lord's Person, he will find much to define his own problems. Even the seemingly obsolete discussions whether Christ had two natures, or two wills, will make him think hard how his own teaching really stands on these heads. Not long ago we had a discussion in the REVIEW of "The Dual Consciousness of the Lord"; but was His consciousness in fact dual? Can one "divide" consciousness as it is then divided? Again, there is the ancient problem of how complete the Lord's humanity was. Was it a humanity lopped off at the top, where the soul belonged not to the humanity, but was the Father, or the Logos? Have we any thought on this which penetrates to the issue? Intricate as they were, and conducted in a world of mental forms now vanished, some of the Christological controversies of the early Christian centuries would still help us with our own teachings on these and other questions. We need not come forward too quickly with the comment that these are all academic questions. It matters for living a life from Christ whether one sees our whole humanity in Him or not. The sermon that grasps the genuine humanity of the Lord will have a power all its own in portraying the Christ to the encouragement of the spiritual life of His followers, and in the assurance of that life to men. The profound inter-relations of Father and Son, dealt with by us usually in the terms of a single figure of speech, will get a sharpened and deepened study as we run the mind through the problems that have exercised the hardiest intellects on this head.

The student who does not think simply to supplant all else with his teaching, but who tries to bring along the good of the whole discussion of the subject and a wider-flung truth, and in the setting of that gets at the flavor and force of his own teaching, really needs all this rich and suggestive and disciplinary

background which the history of Christian thought on the subject offers.

Dr. Cave starts with the Jesus of the Synoptists, not identically pictured even by them. In this opening chapter he also has some helpful estimates of ancient tendencies in the interpretation of the Person of Christ, and of modern tendencies, and guards especially against the construction of a "modern mind" Christ. He names elements in the total picture of Christ, essential in that picture, but disregarded by recent study. His second chapter carries the reader on to interpretations of the Lord's Person which came soon, in Paul, and then in the Johannine books. The story of the developing thought and discussion which the Lord had invited in so many words, "What think ye of Christ?", runs on in the third chapter through the thinking of the first two centuries. The fourth chapter is the stiffest of all, recounting the Christological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries. A subject, profound in itself, received intricate discussion then in terms and concepts we no longer employ. Mr. Cave does a surprisingly successful presentation of the controverted positions in small space. The fifth chapter deals with "The Church of the West to the Reformation"; the sixth with "the Reformation," and what it thought; the seventh is devoted to Schleiermacher and his successors; the eighth to Ritschl and the Modern Period; and the last to "Our Present Problem." "Our Present Problem" emerges out of all this long development. It has added point when held back against the whole history of Christian thought. In the teaching of the New Church is a light, and a supreme light for this whole question. But must we not know where the problem lies in Christendom to turn the light on it? Must we not find out on what side of our teaching, or in what aspect of it, its present most timely and forceful significance is? Not many can enter this field, or need to do so. Those who do, will want to know their ground. Dr. Cave can interest them in a survey of it, and introduce them to more detailed information.

The book is strongly commended for use in connection with study of our own teaching. Our own discussion of our teaching has long been at a stand-still. The scattering of our thought

over seven or eight interpretations (as recounted in McCully's "Swedenborg Studies") might be retrieved in a re-study of the teaching in the light of some command of the history of Christian thought on the subject. The resources in that history, like the resources for the subject in the psychology of religious experience, have not been utilized by us.

So much has been said in urging the use of a book like Dr. Cave's, because there is little point in reviewing it otherwise in a periodical of the New Church. We can present our teaching on the Person of the Lord with verbal fidelity to statements made in the Theological Works, without saying anything of especial significance for current discussion.

To indicate both the clarity of Dr. Cave's narrative, and then the significance of his condensations for our own study, let two extracts be made from the book:

> Little as we know of the historic Jesus, we know enough to see in Him one truly man and yet a Man like no other men, one perfectly obedient to God's will, perfectly certain of his grace, trusting in Him even in Gethsemane, and on the Cross, and revealing God to men, not by what He said alone, but by what He did and was. We know His patience with His disciples, His sympathy with the ignorant and suffering, His courage at the trial, His remembrance of Peter's need, His sorrow, even on the way to the Cross, at the woes which must befall the daughters of Jerusalem, His prayer for those that nailed Him to the Cross, that they might be forgiven for they knew not what they did. Yet, with it all, there was the dignity of one who knew Himself to be in a unique relationship with God, and called to do for God a unique work. We cannot abstract His message from His Person. His proclamation of God and God's kingdom was inseparably connected with Himself, and cannot be understood apart from Him.
>
> The Synoptic Gospels are not the full and final expression of Christianity. They look beyond themselves, for they present a Jesus inexplicable by merely human categories, whom the writers held to be the Church's living Lord. Who was this Man who thus lived and died and rose again? That was a question which it was impossible to evade; and we have now to pass from the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels to the chief of those classic interpretations of Him which form the rest of the New Testament. (Pp. 29, 30.)

Central to Dorner's construction is his idea of the God-manhood of Christ. The Logos, as the revealing principle, so united itself with a man that there could finally result the perfect God-humanity. The

incarnation was thus a process, not a momentary act; a process which was continuous and augmentative. Christ shared in true human growth; and this genuine human development was accompanied by the progressive appropriation of the human by the divine, and by the fuller receptivity of the human for new aspects of the Divine Word. In this way, Dorner sought to harmonize the fact of the human growth of Christ with the doctrine of Divine immutability. In his interpretation of the incarnate life, the states of humiliation and exaltation are regarded, not as successive, but as synchronous. The external humbleness and self-humiliation of Christ, which culminated in the Cross, was accompanied by an increasing inner transfiguration and self-realization of the God-humanity. Before Christ's death, the divine-human union was incompletely realized, for not yet was "He raised above the capacity of suffering and dying, not even above assaults and temptations, and therefore His blessedness was not yet made perfect" and "absolute divine majesty and might were as yet wanting to him." The Cross consummated the union of His Person. His resurrection was a witness to the reality of that union between the divine and the human in Him which death could not break. His ascension was the absolute exaltation of the God-man above all the limits of time and space, so that, in His heavenly session, His Humanity is perfected to be the free and adequate organ of the Word. (Pp. 184, 185.)

Wm. F. Wunsch.

THE FAITH IN A MODERN WORLD*

All Christians are men living in the world; and the modern world is a particularly complex and baffling world in which to live. The past hundred years have seen advances in science—in general knowledge—which our powers of criticism and interpretation have not yet had time to assimilate. Religion, which has to make provision for the needs of the simple as well as of the learned, finds the problem especially acute. The much berated "economy" of the Alexandrian Church has been revived by modernists in the Roman Church and by clergymen of the Protestant denominations who, themselves liberals, are pastors of flocks in whole or in part stubbornly conservative. The

* *Essays, Catholic and Critical.* By members of the Anglican communion; edited by Edward Gordon Selwyn. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1926. 462 pp., 8vo. $3.25.

educated young clergyman would not stay in the church were he not allowed to be "up with the times"—conversant with the results of modern scholarship in matters Biblical and theological; yet he fears, and probably correctly, that to confer upon kindly but unintellectual parishioners his "advanced" views might serve to upset their faith. All of us speak glibly of essentials and non-essentials in religion; but many a simple believer, unable to make this distinction, charges the "advanced" with having taken away his Lord.

The Church of Rome, like the Protestant Fundamentalists, will make no peace with the modern world, with "science". Unitarianism, on the other hand, capitulates entirely, and dares not move one step without the permission of the learned world. That witty Jesuit, Ronald Knox, gibed at the Anglicans that their Christology was dependent upon a daily report, comparable to that on the weather, from Dr. Sanday. The gibe seems substantially true of the Unitarians, who reduce religion to a popularizing mouthpiece of the latest views, an *ancilla scientiae*, and an inculcator of standard morals and good citizenship.

The Anglo-Catholic movement in the Anglican Church, much misunderstood and maligned, has at any rate the virtue of having endeavored to reconcile religion with science and criticism without thereby rendering the science unscientific, the criticism uncritical, or (most important) the religion unreligious. The endeavor is laudable: we want to keep our mental integrity, but we don't want to contaminate our systems of values.

"Essays Catholic and Critical" is an intelligent attempt to work out a theology which is both rational (and so capable of being professed by men brought up in a modern atmosphere) and at the same time (to use a favorite term of our own now growing obsolete) "distinctive", really religious, really mystical. "*Lux Mundi*", a collection of critical and theological studies published in 1896 under the leadership of Dr. Gore, whose career the reviewer outlined in the January REVIEW, was an earlier attempt of the same sort. The period between the two has been marked by advance both toward a more ardent

Catholicism and toward a more trenchant criticism of foundations. To interpret the development will be the work of a longer study which the present writer is engaged upon, and expects soon to finish; but the book under review everywhere assumes that there is no necessary contradiction between what Pascal has called the "reasons of the head and the reasons of the heart". Fr. Selwyn, the editor, summarizes: "For the terms Catholic and critical represent principles, habits, and tempers of the religious mind which only reach their maturity in combination".

The book is divided into three sections: the first canvassing the "pre-suppositions of faith" in anthropology, philosophy, and apologetics; the second ranging over the key problems of theology,—theism, the incarnation, sin, grace vs. freedom, the atonement, the resurrection; the third dealing with the Church as an institution, its history and its sacraments,—more particularly with the history and sacramental theory of the Anglican Church.

Much of the book (perhaps this is an adverse criticism) is given up to a résumé with criticism of scholarly work already done in the field summarized: this is true of the essays on The Emergence of Religion, The Christ of the Synoptic Gospels, The Christian Conception of God, and The Origins of the Sacraments. These give the results of modern scholarship in form suited to the use of the general reader, but cannot be said to advance the argument particularly, or to show evidence of originality on the part of the authors. But there are essays in the volume which present fresh and highly valuable interpretation: such are those by Will Spens, gifted layman, on the Eucharist, by Milner-White on The Spirit and the Church in History, and, best of all, two studies of the difficult, and for Anglicans crucial, problem of authority. The first is by one of the most brilliant of all contemporary theologians, A. E. J. Rawlinson. It defends that characteristically Anglican conception, a *Via Media*. There is a mean, it maintains, between the "purely external and oracular guarantee of intellectual truth" furnished by the Roman Church, and the unlicensed individual-

ism of Protestantism. There is a very real recognition and conception of religious authority which is capable of being reconciled with inner freedom, a conception of authority which is capable of forming the basis of such an essentially liberal and evangelical version of Catholicism as that for which the Anglican Communion, at its best, appears to stand. The true conception of authority is not that of an unverifiable dogmatic pronouncement, but that of "the stubborn persistence of a continuously criticized, tested and verified tradition".

Both Rawlinson and Wilfred Knox, the second writer on authority, disclaim any pragmatic conception of the subject; but such, like most Anglo-Catholics, they appear really to hold. Knox thinks

> It would appear that, just as the inherent authority of a particular pronouncement [by the Church] depends on the extent to which it really represents a wide consensus of Christian experience, so the proof of that authority will lie in the extent to which it really commends itself by its power to survive as a living element in the consciousness of the whole Christian body.

Passages of this kind sufficiently attest the inadequately acknowledged indebtedness of Anglo-Catholic epistemology and apologetic to the writing of those great Catholic modernists, Frs. Loisy and Tyrrell. Perhaps it is not too much to say that the case for the new liberal Anglo-Catholicism stands or falls with its essential pragmatism. Fashionable as this at present is, much as it works in with that other fashion in circles philosophical and religious, namely, mysticism, much as it seems to do justice to aspects of human life and human nature previously neglected, one may be permitted to wonder whether in the long run the Roman Church will not be found wisely to have decided against all such apologetic, to have made her claims subject entirely to those rational tests which will outlive, as they have preceded, the current fashion.

AUSTIN WARREN, PH.D.

"AN OUTLINE OF NEW-CHURCH TEACHING"*

The recent volume by the Rev. Wm. F. Wunsch entitled "An Outline of New-Church Teaching" should serve a very useful purpose in the clarification of thought of those who wish to understand the theological teachings of Swedenborg as presented by the New Church. For careful division of subject matter, clear and economical progression, and attractive diction, it fulfils the function of a handbook admirably. The Vermont farmer who stands for sixteen hours over a single pan of maple sap, watching the surprising diminution of the liquid as it slowly boils down to syrup, will serve as a symbol of the care with which Mr. Wunsch has done his work, concentrating in remarkably small compass a diffuse and massive volume of material, which requires intimate acquaintance for the production of such a summary as this book represents.

Yet is it not true that any exposition of theological doctrine were best brief, notably so in this day and age? It is to be hoped that, when the need of Christian union is being more and more forced upon our attention, no branch of the Christian Church will feel impelled to offer a *sine qua non* which will be very much in excess of that which is acceptable to every other branch. There are some things on which all Christendom is agreed, otherwise it is a parody to speak of "the church of Christ". Candid admission must allow that those things are not

---

* *An Outline of New-Church Teaching,* with Illustrative Standard Passages. By Wm. F. Wunsch. New York: New-Church Press. 1926. 260 pp. (150 of text, followed by 106 in smaller type from Swedenborg), 8vo. $1.50.

In view of the fact that a suggestion of Rev. J. Rex Shepler's was one thing that led to the preparation of this volume, the author's wish that Mr. Shepler be requested to review it was followed, especially as the latter had previously manifested sympathetic appreciation of some of Swedenborg's teachings. The reviewer's father is a very prominent Methodist clergyman of Massachusetts, and he himself has recently been ordained and settled as pastor of the Washington Street Methodist Episcopal Church in Newburyport, Mass. In his review he makes known some of the difficulties that Swedenborg's writings present to him. We naturally hope that these objections will eventually be dissipated in his mind.—*Editor.*

overly numerous, theologically. Will not every individual branch of the church universal exert more weight and influence in the large, if it emphasizes that which binds us together, and exhibits a becoming moderation in that which sets it apart? Pursuance of this ideal will mean briefer books of doctrine, as it has already meant a cessation of factional apologetics.

In this light it is pleasing to find Mr. Wunsch dealing so catholicly with a system of thought which, as much as any, is tempted to expansive speculation, however authoritatively that speculation may be clothed.

There are three divisions in the outline: namely, the Spiritual Life, the Word, and the Lord. Under the first we find mainly the following ideas: faith and charity; the new life; and the spiritual world. The second involves revelation and the Scriptures; and the third is based on the idea of the Trinity. Certainly this is fundamental treatment, and would be attractive to the lay student of any denomination anxious to know the essence of what religion has for him.

No Methodist would discuss very long what his religion meant to him without reference to the great reviving mission of John Wesley, and the fact that any man's heart may, like his, be "strangely warmed". No Congregationalist would be true to his traditions without appeal to the love of freedom bequeathed by his Puritan spiritual ancestors, some of whom he would call by name. In much larger degree does the New-Church believer rightfully turn to the personality of Swedenborg, and call him to witness for some of the best teachings by which he lives. Mr. Wunsch has been discreetly and happily temperate in the use of the name of the great theologian and "servant of the Lord"; he appeals first of all to a reasonable faith. But the remarkable contributions of thought for which Swedenborg is admired as a theologian are necessarily in the foreground, and fill this outline with the spirit of one personality as not even a Methodist handbook could approach.

This fact is both a weakness and a strength. It is a weakness in that the structure of thought is rendered somewhat esoteric

to readers to whom this dominating personality is not already a familiar figure. Nevertheless Mr. Wunsch has at least achieved an independent diction, which, if somewhat cramped, has the contemporary ring. It is a strength in that some of the profoundest achievements of all religious belief are designated here. Some of them have been caught up with in the Protestant Church at large since Swedenborg first expressed them,—such as the significance of judgment, the humanity of the Divine Lord, and the immanence of God. Others still remain to be popularized in religious circles,—such as the principles of the spiritual world. Still others may abide indefinitely as strong meat for the few,—such as the spiritual interpretations of Scripture.

The late John T. McFarland, predecessor of the present editor of Sunday-school literature in the Methodist Church, once had an experience which bears on the revelation of Swedenborg. In the prime of life he was stricken with sickness so severe that his recovery was despaired of, and his friends waited merely for the seemingly inevitable outcome of his unconscious state. But he survived, telling of a wonderful experience he had had, too removed for words. In the many years of active service which he spent following this sickness, he lived in the exaltation of his vision, and referred all that he did to the noble assurance that had come to him through the eyes of the spirit. One judges such individuals by their works rather than by their professions. Dr. McFarland spoke, not with his mouth, but with a beautiful life.

Emanuel Swedenborg gave expression to what Mr. E. Brayley Hodgetts has called "reasonable religion", and from that we derive greater faith in him than by his "memorable relations". Similarly with the miracles of Jesus himself, and not by the miraculous witness primarily. If we dissent from any one specifically, it is because it does not seem in harmony with that character. So we may dissent or suspend judgment on particular phases of Swedenborg's propositions, if we care to, if our ideal of a "reasonable religion" does not harmonize with the appeal to special revelation.

I should like to mention one such feature which Mr. Wunsch, with good taste, makes little of, but which has a larger emphasis in the works of Swedenborg himself. That is the doctrine of attendant spirits and angels. It would seem to weaken the appeal of religion to young people today, if one resurrects this anthropomorphic conception of good and evil, and attempts to give it standing in the face of a developing psychology and a centralizing of philosophy on the fact of personality. Swedenborg did away with the devil long ahead of his time. With such an illuminating insight as he has shown into the processes of the Holy Spirit, and such a staggering conception of the Divine Providence as is fundamental to his philosophy, it seems to me both inconsistent and strange that he should have delegated some of the Holy Spirit's work to divers and sundry ministers plenipotentiary, such as good and evil spirits, when his ideal of the Holy Spirit is fully big enough to embrace the whole matter alone.

One out of many apposite quotations in Swedenborg which indicate the all-sufficient presence of the Lord is as follows:

> The Lord's foresight and providence is in the very minutest of all these most individual things, and in things so very minute that it is impossible by any stretch of thought to comprehend a thousand thousandth part of them (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3854).

Now a stretch of thought which imagines the Lord Himself, as the Holy Spirit, being the spring of all good thoughts and true in the human mind, without any intermediary vicars to express His will, angels though they be, ought not to be too much for the man who could make the above quotation. And indeed it is not, as Swedenborg shows clearly when he discusses the Holy Spirit alone. As for the evil thoughts, the psychology of an active, creative mind linked with physical stimuli will account for them. Even so, these attendant spirits are mere stage creatures as Swedenborg describes them: the good ones predominate when the man is good, the evil ones predominate when the man is evil; but neither is responsible for actual shifting of the balance of character, and each graciously gives way, if the other is declared to predominate. They seem to me as shadowy and functionless as Kant's thing-in-itself.

Fortunately the question of attendant spirits is not nearly as prominent in Mr. Wunsch's volume as this review might suggest. Several matters of genuine importance should leave their mark on the earnest student of the book. One is the personal character of all religious achievement. The author early lays down the principle that truth "is to be found in an intelligence, and in the mind, and at length the object of faith must be He Who is 'the Truth'" (p. 20). Faith "is a confidence of person in Person." This immediately does away with the danger of intellectual arrogance, which is the besetting sin of many seekers after religious truth. It is the guarantee that the will as well as the mind will be active. Throughout the book the ideal is fundamental: the living personality of the Savior is never lost sight of, and all life is related to it.

Another ideal impressed by the book is the supremacy of the spiritual. No greater message than this needs to be stressed in our preaching today. The general tone of life gives so much leeway to that which crushes out the hunger for spiritual attainment, that we are indebted to a presentation which, like this, considers the spiritual life with its very definite problems, and lays a solid foundation for confidence in its reality.

A prominent place is of course given to the Divine Humanity of the Lord. There is nothing more inspiring in the thought of the volume, or more indicative of the influence of Swedenborg's thought within the last century, than the development of this subject. The lack of emphasis by evangelical thought in years past on the humanity of the Lord has led to many reactions and much confusion, which might have been avoided. The Unitarianism of William Ellery Channing has become in many respects the dominating Protestant thought of today. The human Jesus has at last received his rightful recognition, and we no longer burden the toddler in the Nazareth shop with the shadow of the Cross, as he runs in the sunshine to his mother with his arms outstretched. Swedenborg was one of the real pioneers in this humanizing of theology, and it is his glory that the Divinity of the Lord is grounded and harmonized with it

in an equally appealing way. Mr. Wunsch's treatment of this subject is one of the best parts of the book.

JOHN REX SHEPLER.

A NEW BOOK ON THE PARABLES*

The Lord's parables were based on scenes and customs familiar to those who listened to His teaching, but often unfamiliar to us. It is a help if someone thoroughly at home in these matters of local setting can let us look with his eyes and listen with his ears. In his volume on "The Parables, Their Background and Local Setting," the Rev. Mr. Levison does us this service. He tells us of himself:

> My qualifications for supplying the local coloring are based on my great privilege of having been brought up in Galilee, within sight of Nazareth and the surrounding country—the very places in which a great many of the parables were spoken. When I say that, up to the time I was sent to school in Jerusalem, I had not seen a vehicle of any description, and that the Old Testament narratives were as intelligible as the freshly written accounts of yesterday's events, it may indicate how primitive and free from change our life in Safad was.

The author helps us also to realize what the parables must have meant to the disciples and the multitudes who heard them on the background of their religious beliefs and training and their imperfect and slowly developing conception of the Lord's kingdom.

The effort is made in the study of each parable to lift the thought to the spiritual plane and to see the application of the parable to Christian life today. This, which is the most important phase of the study, is to us the least satisfying. We miss here a distinct recognition of a real spiritual sense within the natural objects and incidents which form the letter of the Scripture, and of any consistent method of arriving at the deeper universal meaning. The book could be read very usefully in connection with a book of spiritual exposition.

WM. L. WORCESTER.

---

* *The Parables: Their Background and Local Setting.* By THE REV. N. LEVISON. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1926. 278 pp., 8vo. $2.50.

YANKEE PROPHETS*

Dr. Van Ness, pastor of the Second Unitarian Society of Brookline, Mass., has done the students of New England history and thought a service by the private publication of his recently delivered lectures on Religious Life in New England. There is nothing pretentious in style or thought about the little book; it is the unmodified transcription of agreeable chat, and its philosophical interpretation is that of a sympathetic amateur. But Dr. Van Ness saw and knew many of the persons about whom he writes. He can recall, of the men who graced what Lewis Mumford has recently called the Golden Age of America, at least Emerson: like the presumptuous Bok, he saw the old philosopher in his decline—once in his home, and again at Longfellow's funeral. With the Silver Age and its illustrious, Van Ness was contemporary: he knew Hale and Phillips Brooks and Mrs. Eddy.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is devoted to the founder of Christian Science. I have found nowhere else what seems so frank and unbiased a depiction of this remarkable woman. Van Ness early appreciated her significance, and paid tribute to her from his pulpit; but he would not, as he might have done, sink into satellitism. He describes Mrs. Eddy's conversations with him as monologues; speaks of her as a woman possessed of (or by) a single idea, the allness of God; characterizes her as "not a reader", not interested in books and authors. For her "sources" he points convincingly to Shakerism (the reviewer has somewhere in his writings made the same suggestion), to the mesmerists, to the spiritualists, and to Quimby. Dr. Van Ness fails to point out her derivation from Emerson: as I have elsewhere suggested (*New-Church Review*, July, 1922, "The Teachings of Emerson"), to "Mother" Eddy we should add "Father" Emerson.

Nowhere do I note any reference to Swedenborg and his often mentioned liberalizing and spiritualizing influence in New

---

* *The Religion of New England.* By Thomas Van Ness. Boston: The Beacon Press. 1926. 205 pp., 12mo. $1.60.

England theology, or to those sweet and other-worldly, "mystical" people, the Swedenborgians. Berkeley and the Bible are given as Quimby's sources. Dr. Horatio Dresser figures in a chapter on "New Thought"; but nothing is said of his having "moved on".

AUSTIN WARREN, PH.D.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT

¶ A cheap, well illustrated and concise life of Emanuel Swedenborg.
¶ Suitable for the use of all the Societies and Missionary Institutions of the Church.

The MISSIONARY AND TRACT SOCIETY of London begs to announce the republication of the

"LIFE OF SWEDENBORG"

By the late J. Stuart Bogg. Revised by Rev. H. G. Drummond.

5 x 7½ inches; 40 pages and paper cover; 15 illustrations.
Price Threepence, postage extra, (say 10c. postpaid).

Order of NEW-CHURCH PRESS, Ltd.,
1, Bloomsbury Street, London, W. C. 1, England

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the
Massachusetts New-Church Union
134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
LIBRARY EDITION, $1.50 per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

THE AMERICAN SWEDENBORG PRINTING AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY

16 East 41st Street New York, N. Y.

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.
"The Worship and Love of God."
Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.
Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.
"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 516 N. Eutaw St.
Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Room 1726, 17 N. State St.
Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak and Winslow Streets.
Detroit, Mich. Church Book Shop, 46 Forest Ave., E.
Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
Minneapolis, Minn. New-Church Book Shop, 903 Fifth Ave., So.
New York, N. Y. Amer. Swedenborg Printing and Pub. Soc., 16 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights, N. Y. City.
Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 3741 Windsor Place.
Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street.
Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 486 Euclid Ave.

ENGLAND.

Bath. New-Church Book Room, Green St.
London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. I.
Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland, 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay, Swedenborg Society of India, 7 Topiwala's Bldgs., Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Lausanne, Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 1 Avenue de France.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reprodnctions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

CLARENCE W. BARRON, *President*,
GEORGE C. WARREN,
JAMES E. YOUNG, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.